

Jihadi Terrorism

On the trail of its

Epistemology

And

Geneology

TS Girishkumar

A personal note

I had been at these thoughts for many years, and it is some thing more than ten years ago that I actually thought of writing this. It had to take time, patience and much pain of many kinds. The division of India was yet another source of confusion to me right from the childhood, and I was much curious to interact with Muslims available to me. During the early school days, it was with great difficulty that I could get a Muslim friend who had shown me the holy book, Al-Queran, very secretly with the promise that I will speak to none about the whole episode. It is that curiosity that had eventually gone into the making of this book.

My PhD students, all of them always stood by me, in everything, discussions to criticisms. The list shall be above twentyfive; I shall not go into mentioning the names. Friends used to be another source of inspiration, on a continued basis. Some very critical, and some others supportive, both were of immense significance. My wife and three children were always with me, for everything, albeit they live in *Vadōdara*. My mothers blessings, youger brothers love, they all mattered much.

The river *Narmada* inispires me greatly. Legends has it, the ancient king of Kerala, *Mahābali*, lived there, in todays Bharuch District of Gujarat. *San̄karācharya*, the propounder of the philosophy of unqualified monism (*Advaita Vēdaṇṭa*) had gone to the banks of river Narmada looking for a teacher (*Achārya*) to find *Achārya Gōvīṇḍapāda* and to learn from him, apart from his teacher *Goudapāda*’s interpretations of the Upanishads.

All these makes river Narmada much dear to my heart, and auspicious. Every time I go home to my family, I get refreshed and renewed strength fills me from within through Narmada. The river Ganjes (Ganga) is auspicious to every Indian, and the presence of *Viswanātha* and Ganga together at *Vāranāsi*, the atmosphere where *Tulsidāsa* wrote *Rāmcharitamānas*, all had refreshed my mind from time to time.

It had been my fortune to have born in India, and for every birth that I may have, I long to be born again and again in this very land, that is, until it is *Mōkṣa* for me. I am indebted to all these, and indebted to my Nation.

TS Girishkumar

Introducing an understanding to the Phenomenon of Terrorism

Let us not have any doubts in our minds that one of the important problems that the world has to face and resolve in future times shall be that of Terrorism. What began as a sporadic and not very organised phenomenon of differences which paved the way to separatism had now gone a long way to become somewhat organised, systematised and also inter connected one another, which is also becoming a regular affair. Indeed, there must be organised attempts from all World Nations to combat terrorism: and this effort must go much beyond mere declaration of solidarity with some nations, who propose to combat terrorism, who many be the direct victims. As a matter of fact, things are coming to a point of no return; and as on now, there is no effective solution in sight. A proper and effective solution is yet to evolve, and this would take time, understanding, and consensus among the nations, as well as societies of the world. This, would become inevitable, as for the future, the very peaceful co-existence of all world society is going to depend on eliminating terrorism. Future might bring newer dangers, and more difficult ones to deal with, but then, we shall not know them until they manifest. For the present time, it is terrorism that is going to consume happiness of civilised human existence.

A hermeneutics of terrorism ought to begin with the origin of sources of thoughts creating terrorism in the minds of terrorists. Why do some people, in spite of their education as well as many other so called good things in life become terrorists? Our experiences are that, it is those educated ones who become terrorists in most cases. Why so? Something must be 'wrong' with their thinking that they seem to be convinced as 'right', or 'the right'. What is more, their thought process is so strong that they simply can throw away their very lives for the sake of their so called 'goals' which indeed is not very clear and is rather confusing, not only to others, but also to the terrorists themselves. Hence it is certainly not a logo of thought system, or an 'ideology' in which they are so desperately convinced as it used to be the case with some of the erstwhile Communists or with Hitler and the Aryan 'Race theory'. Apart from the projected image of a "Dar-UI-Islam" which is an Islamic state with Islamic ideals and ideology, there seem to be no other ideology for the terrorists. Even this Dar-UI-Islam itself is a very fragmented thought with so many contradictions and differences built into them, that one such ideals contradicts the other, another and so on. This is an analysis made on the experience of seeing many sects within Islam, who contradict one another and often fight one another, for reasons so petty and trivial as well as confusing to any onlooker with sanity. When the people who belong to one religion do not coexist in any peaceful manner among themselves, even though there shall be Dar-UI-Islams, then it is simply a matter of conjecture that such Dar-UI-Islams shall go on fighting one another ad-infinity to major chaos and eventual self-destruction.

Now the scenario is this: There is terrorism and it is coming up in a major manner which has to be the concern of all; but we do not know very well as to why there are terrorists. We do not really know what is that which makes some people terrorists in any real sense. Since we do not

know what really makes people terrorists, we are also unable to think in terms of a solution to this. To say that Islam is the cause of terrorism shall be utterly reductionistic and absolutely wrong; as the very function of any religion is to put man at the transcendental level directly or indirectly. It is impossible and even contradictory to conceive of any religion as causing terrorism. Then why Islamic Jihad and Islamic terrorism? Some would argue that the whole thing lies with the manner in which Islam gets interpreted by the so called autochthones, or the religious authorities. But then, this too is a too narrow interpretation or definition of the matter in discussion. Here it shall make sense to ask the question that if the autochthones make such interpretations, then what is that which making them do so? Obviously, we are again back to square one.

Let us go to the fundamentals of human nature to begin with understanding the complex phenomenon of terrorism. First of all, let us go for a Philosophical approach to the problem, and then a more mundane approach subsequently. In the Philosophy of Religion, people like Cassian R. Agera spoke about a 'fundamental intentionality of the human consciousness towards the sacred'. This Harvard scholar, who also happens to be my teacher, would further say that all world religions are expressions of this fundamental intentionality towards the sacred on a final analysis, expressions those are shaped and manifested through the knowledge system and culture of any given time and given society. From this, it could be stated that it is a matter of common sense that every human who is also conscious has intentionalities, which may be towards the transcendental, or may be to something else. Let me say that such intentionalities could be vertical and horizontal to begin with. A vertically oriented intentionality or longing in the human consciousness mostly tends to be spiritual or more strictly, a transcendental longing. Great minds like Buddha etc. could be examples here. A horizontally oriented longing or intentionality tends to do services to mankind or society, personalities like Gandhi could be thought about in this context. And then, it is also possible to think about some others, in whom the longing could be negative, or downwards. Such negativities could result in making of criminals and other anti socials. In reality, all these three developments are present in every human, but their development varies in different people differently as Plato himself speaks in his theory of Soul, to create an ideal society. Let us say, that man in common parlance could be a mixture of all these three. Since these different aspects are not present with equal vigour, some aspect dominates, and some other aspect remains dormant, and depending on what dominates with what mixture and to what percentage, human personalities develop. There is no rigidity here, the ratio and proportion can always vary, or may also remain more or less steady in some cases.

Let me say, that people with negatively developed inclinations or longings becomes criminals, anarchists, separatists and terrorists. However, the point here is 'ideas of differences and separation' which develops in the minds of such people. On a common parlance, it is a matter of common sense that you are different and separate from me. Ontologically, this is only a matter of both practice and common sense, given nature's nature. But then, these ideas of separation and difference will have to stop or end somewhere if one aspires for any kind of coexistence. Perhaps one of the reasons why marriages breaks down is due to the over stress of this difference and separatism. On the contrary, should the couples feel that they are one, breaking families many not be as common a phenomena as it is of now.

Hence, ideas of difference and separation shall hold the key to the beginning of terrorism. On a final analysis, such ideas as 'one is different from the other', renders one unable to co-exist in a spontaneous and meaningful manner. There shall always be something lurking behind the mind in the form of some or the other doubt; with which one shall be unable to trust and, indeed, love. The moral as well as practical aspect of Christian love shall simply amount to human beings co-existing one another in some form of trust and love. This may be the best way for a better world. On the other hand, mistrust and dislike, (which shall develop into hatred in the stronger sense) shall create isolated individuals floating in the confused waters of existence in disorder and anarchy, not being affected at all by whatever happens to the other. Existentialism and the thoughts that 'the other is a threat to one's existence' spring forth from such self-orientations, and what more shall be further required calling them as "Negative Philosophies"? I am trying to trace connections between such epistemology of differences which leads to separatism, the separatism that eventually leads to intolerance of the other and then culminates in terrorism.

Muslim terrorism of today has its roots in India, and it all began with this idea of differences and separatism originated through such differences. There are few things fundamental to the religion of Islam which was effectively used to create and maintain differences and separation. History tells us that Islam chiefly came to India through invasions, invasions which aimed at the wealth in the beginning, but they later settled down in India as rulers. Muslims found Indians, and the Hindus very different from what they had been used to; and found their culture and language enviable. On the other hand, the Hindus were traditionally proud of their heritage, their literature, classics and philosophy, and above all, the language of Sanskrit. Sanskrit language had not been any one's mother tongue as such, it was a language synthetically created by scholars for the purpose of scholarship. The language has amazing abilities to compress, preserve and transmit knowledge trans time and space, with considerably less loss of ideas, that might happen in common communication processes. The grammar created for Sanskrit itself shall speak of everything, and no explanation or illustrations are further needed to discuss the capability of the Sanskrit language in preserving knowledge with much lesser efforts, strain, and loss of concepts.

With the advent of Muslim rule in parts of India, through time, Hindus who stayed away from the alien rule slowly began interactions with them. At the same time, the rulers and their offices also began to know the people of the land more intimately. Conversions of locals into Islam, for whatever reasons that might be, also functioned as a buffer between the two compartments, further making their interactions much easy. What we witness some time later is a phenomenon that all were speaking the same language, in common place. Hence for common people, there remained one lingo Franca, for all practical reasons. And not all were able to read and write, which used to be a common thing.

But then, there were something, something different for those who went for education. Traditionally, for Indians, education meant Sanskrit education, and studying the Vedic Culture in many forms. Religion as it is called today was an integral part of learning as well as teaching. Everything in Indian culture has just one aim, or objective, and that is transcendence, Moksha. Everything was spiritually oriented, and the materialist Carvaka also adopted the same method to negate God and Soul. Transcendence, Liberation or *Mōkṣa* could variously be interpreted as subjective, and for some, objective also. They also had a script, the *Dēvanāgarī* script.

The Muslims could not be a party to this pattern of education as a general case. It is also the case that, the Hindus also did not accept every one as students, a teacher always looked into many things before taking a student. Both the way, the Muslims did not become a party to this pattern of education, albeit it remains a fact that they did not give much stress on education. That is why it is not surprising to see the Muslim ruler Akbar the great, an illiterate who was unable to read and write, whereas the Hindu Kings, mostly scholars.

However, Islam is now in India. There was a definite influence of the Indian culture, which is rather inescapable. Many people who became Muslims were also originally Hindus, and they just cannot shun their ways of living overnight. Here emerges the unique aspect of Islam, as the Indian Muslims. Indian society is the society that never forbids any kind of knowledge, provided that is knowledge. They had already created knowledge such as the *Upaniṣads*, as well as knowledge such as the *Kāma Sūtra*. Since the *Sūtra* had erotic elements in it, people could shy away, and they had made sculptures of many aspects of the *Sūtra* and placed them at temple walls: where everyone goes. Indeed, that was an amazing step! With such liberal attitudes to knowing, a religious Islamic authority as we see these days took much time to show up in India, and eventually when they did evolve, they never could be powerful as they used to be elsewhere. Here I would like to argue that the freest type of Islam, at least in those days, existed only in India. It was a liberal Islam, with hardly any rigidity as seen today. It is also a matter to note that in India, Islam is still a much liberated religion, with hardly any one caring for nefarious authorities wanting to play hegemony.

There emerged a brand of Muslim scholars in India, as a natural result. Muslims also went to educate themselves like others, and from those educated Muslims came a brand of Muslim intellectuals. There was always a problem, what kind of education the Muslims shall go for? We do not know that how many of them might have gone to learn Sanskrit and the Sanskrit pattern, there must have been many. What we see next is the phenomena of Muslim intellectuals trying to juxtapose Sanskrit with Persian. How seriously Indian Muslims are related to Iran is a matter to be investigated, but it became the case that most Muslim intellectuals learned Persian, and could read, write and speak Persian. Then there came the polarity, *Brāhmaṇs* went to learn Sanskrit and Muslims went to learn Persian.

This could be seen as the first attempt of drawing differences resulting in separation and separatism. Further, through time, the Muslims started using Persian scripts for writing the spoken language, which is Hindi. Traditionally, people were using *Dēvanāgarī* script to write Hindi, but subsequently the Muslims wrote the same language in Persian script. They started calling this Persian scriptural writing as Urdu, while others continued using *Dēvanāgarī* and the name Hindi. Same language, two different scripts, and two different names. This becomes the second formidable move towards separatism.

Subsequently, through time, the Muslim intellectuals started concentrating more on the differences between Islam and others. India already had all world religions co-existing, but this orientation towards differences and drawing lines of separation was something new. Thus, ideas of differences leading to separatism came as a result from wrongly placed premises of the Intellectuals. And then, much later, came reactions, actions and reactions, and so on.

After weapons of mass destruction from the last century, what the world today faces as the worst threat is terrorism in its manifoldness. Perhaps every century is phenomenal in having certain characteristics; we have had a Hitler and World Wars, we had people like McCauley and Max Muller with 'Ideologies' to intellectually legitimise social domination as in the case of the colonial rule of British in India, to intellectually legitimise that the British are entitled to rule and dominate India through an Aryan 'race theory'. Battles, invasions, occupations, freedom struggles, liberations, and then came the new type of invasion of the market and corporate forces, and now, latest, this phenomenon of terrorism emerging as the most fearsome of all. Many people trace the beginning of terrorism with the very beginning of Islam as a religion, and the Arab invasion of Sindh by Mohammad Bin Qasim and the then forceful religious conversion of Hindus into Islam.

This was in eighth century, and indeed all the areas where Qasim went, he destroyed and made the people Muslims, and those who refused to become Muslims were simply beheaded. It is possible for one to look at these acts of brutalities of invasions and forceful conversions as either the beginning of or as terrorism itself in a larger perspective. People, who speak of Islamic terrorism, may naturally link the very beginning of Islam itself as the beginning of terrorism. To say that Jihadi terrorism begins with the religion of Islam itself may have a logic of its own, but I would like to look at this phenomenon through a different logic and perspective.

First of all, I do not wish to link terrorism with the religion of Islam unconditionally, though one could produce many arguments against me in this. Fact of the matter is, it is possible for one to interpret Islam and their holy book in both ways, one can interpret it in support of terrorism, and at the same time, one can also interpret the religion of Islam as peaceful and friendly. Since such is the story of interpretation, the blame of spreading terrorism ought to fall upon the interpreters, and certainly not upon a faith system.

Nonetheless, my purpose is entirely different. I conceive of terrorism closer to its present day meaning, which is rather distinct from its erstwhile connotations. Terrorism today is a voluntary action on the part of those who support it. It is a voluntary action, because people perform it with full consciousness and volition. At this point, there could be an argument that this volition, which appears to be voluntary action, is indirectly induced into the performers through some kind of deception. Well, when this is the case, here develops the two horns of dilemma, as explained by Aristotle himself. From this it comes to the point that Terrorism is either a fully conscious and Voluntary action, which makes terrorists entirely responsible for their action leaving no room for any kind of redemption, and otherwise, it is performed under Ideological deception through some Ideologies in operation. Here the situation becomes worse; it poses the presence of intellectual legitimisation of terrorism through some interpretations of Islam.

I am inclined to consider the latter option for my venture into this study. Terrorism is ignited under the spell of formidable Ideological deception, which is indeed intellectual legitimisation of terrorism. This makes the terrorists much at ease to involve in terrorist acts, they are fully convinced that they are right, very just, and they simply perform their duty, which has divine sanctity, and it is all for the cause of the ultimate reality, supernatural, and God almighty. He is fully convinced, no matter how educated he is, and in fact, the more one is educated, the easier it becomes to

'convince' him, to turn him into an effective terrorist intellectually. And, precisely, this becomes the "epistemology" of terrorism of modern times.

It is interesting to trace the Epistemology of terrorism. There is no denying the fact that terrorism does have an epistemology of its own; without which it cannot take roots and function; first into the minds of many, and then finally into impact making practices of explosions as well as mass destructions.

Perhaps one could trace an epistemology of terrorism right into the very concept of Islam itself, thereby making Qasim simply a follower of that binding epistemology. But then, if at all this could be done even very well, it is not very easy to understand and interpret contemporary terrorism through such an epistemology, though this might be universal in appearance, but in fact shall fail to explain the phenomenon of terrorism as experienced and understood today, and perhaps in days to come. Hence, my venture had been to locate the intellectual backing of terrorism, its beginning, how and to what all extent the intellectual legitimisation of terrorism had grown into something akin to an occult science which had become cancerous into the young and fertile Muslim minds. This shall remind us of how Communism had caught the intelligent and fertile young minds once upon a time, and when the popular movement designed by Marx had been rejected by the popular mass, the so called Marxist intellectuals withdrew themselves into Universities to lure and misguide enthusiastic young minds who might carry some kind of fetishism of being and becoming intellectuals by joining University departments and once under the spell of erstwhile Communists who now disguises as 'Critical Theorists' Post modernists, Structuralists and so on, through heavy jargon mongering, as well as creating utter confusions in the minds of people. These lots do not have any logic at all, and whatever they project as logic or fuzzy logic is in fact only spurious logic.

The first premises of an epistemology of intolerance and not accepting 'the other' arises from how plurality and multiplicity is perceived and understood. Granted that the very nature of 'nature' is plurality and multiplicity, there is nothing much one could do about it, and however desperate one might crave for some kind of homogeneity. In fact, the very desire towards homogeneity arises from one's inability to both understand as well as to live with the nature as the way nature is. Plurality and multiplicity had been the way with nature, and no one is above as well as below, no one superior and no one inferior. Each blade of grass, each particular in the universe had always been one and unique, there had been and there will be nothing like any one particular in the universe. Uniqueness with the nature is trans time, of past, of present, and also of the future. Each small particulars are unique, there will not be another like the one, trans time and space.

Now, how shall we look at this infinite multitude of plurality and multiplicity? How these particulars are related to one another? Are they inter connected at all? Indeed one cannot think of a loose sack of a universe with the multitude of particulars not connected to one another. They are connected; they have to be, but how?

Two drastically different and important positions in epistemology develop at this point, which can account for many confusions and theories and positions that occurred in the history of human thoughts. Let me go into these two positions very briefly.

A. Particulars are inter connected, but unique. They have some kind of autonomy about them, and their uniqueness makes them different from one another. Hence they are related to one another through the relations of differences, which can subsequently develop contradictions among themselves, as first Hegel thought, and later Marx declared as a final theory.

B. Particulars are not autonomous as they might appear to be. Their differences are only apparent. There is an underlying unity among all particulars, transcending what they appear to be. Thus, they do not contradict one another, and on the contrary, they do co-exist in perfect harmony of nature. This becomes the epistemology of togetherness and co-existence as against the epistemology of differences and contradiction.

The latter is exclusively Indian. To an outside mind, the very existence of India as one nation used to be an amazing and mind boggling phenomena. People often thought that at any point in time, India shall fall apart, since it is a nation with so many 'differences' all built into one. Many have predicted the falling apart of India into many fragments, especially as the British were quitting India. And none of such falling apart had happened in the past years, and there is also no indication to any such thing. Communist historians also thought that India may not continue to exist as a coherent nation, and they went to the extent of saying that India was united by the British rule. Communists, with their epistemology of difference, could not have understood the co-existing effects from Indian epistemology. Certain things are unique with India, and this epistemology is one such thing. Looking at the multiplicity and plurality of nature, as mere varieties of one underlying principle, instead of isolated particulars that contradict one another, is the unique aspect of Indian epistemology. Yet another uniqueness is how knowledge is understood in Indian epistemology. It is categorically stated that "knowledge worth the name must have the property of 'affectivity' ", implying that knowledge must affect the knower, (*Nyāya Sūtra by Gautama*). This position simply rules out mere intellectual training or collection of information as knowledge, and this also explains that why many people who are very well informed still remain barbaric and callous.

I thought of giving this small narration upon Indian epistemology, because it is this Indian society that I am to look at to search for the beginning of Jihadi terrorism in the full sense of the term as used in modern times, Jihadi terrorism as an 'Ideology', to look for intellectual legitimisation of Jihadi terrorism and the like. I wish to take a very short period of time to make this analysis, which is from 1857 to 1947. This span of a period of ninety years can demonstrate all the intricacies and under currents of an 'Islamic thought structure', which functions as the intellectual edifice of contemporary Jihadi terrorism.

The period from 1857 to 1847 is all important. Between 1857 and 1947, the activities of Muslim intellectuals in India have a universal character. An analysis of the Muslim intellectual activities of this period can well demonstrate the intellectual foundations of contemporary Jihadi terrorism. The year 1857 kindled intellectual activities among the Muslims all of a sudden, and it has its own historical foundations.

First of all, among all Muslims of the world, the then Indian Muslims were the most educated as well as affluent. Unlike in the past, they were western educated, and English educated. There is one more important aspect that made them different from others and powerful, and that was Indian Culture itself. Normally, Muslim societies are closed societies, not allowing much of independence and freedom. The underlying bearing of some or the other version and interpretation on Islam and Quran controls the society usually through some self styled authochthones, and this slowly limits their free intellectual activities, and if permitted to go on, shall eventually culminate in Talibanism, using the contemporary term for it. This, indeed had happened in some parts of the world, where Muslims are in majority.

In India, Muslims enjoyed and enjoy a kind of freedom not found in any other Muslim societies. India, which still is a Hindu majority society functions on the edifice of the kind of epistemology mentioned before. This permits any type of faith system and religious practices, to go on unhindered. Hindus never teach that I am only right and you all are wrong. Since Hindus were in majority, the Islamic religious authority also could not assume power and authority except in small pockets, which could not have had wider impacts. The freedom and flexibility within Indian society gave equal chances to the Muslims as well to an exposure of limitless and unconditional knowledge. Never in history knowledge was forbidden or limited to anything, this society had permitted knowledge from Metaphysics of *Vēdanta* to Erotics of *Kāma Sūtra* and Heterodox systems up to Materialism. Thus emerged a Muslim elite in Indian society, not only rich, but also well-educated and knowledgeable. It must be noted that they are the same Muslims who take pride in the so called great Mughal rule, where we have emperors like Akbar the great who did not know how to read and write, unlike his Hindu 'colleagues' who were all great scholars!

The year 1857 also has another significance. It kindled a Muslim feeling and questions of separate Muslim Identity among Indian Muslims. 1857 saw the first struggle towards independent India. Colonial rulers called the struggle a 'Sepoy Mutiny' mutiny by the soldiers as it all began with some Indian soldiers in the British army revolting against certain things. Subsequently many others joined the struggle and it became the first collective movement towards freedom. The name, first freedom struggle was given to this movement by *Vināyak Damōdar Savarkar* who is also known as *Swatantra Vīr Savarkar*, though many historians continued to call it a soldiers mutiny.

The first freedom struggle changed many things in India. Till that time the rulers were only East India Company, but with the first freedom movement, the British Crown became the ruler of colonial India. It also created a fear in the minds of the Muslims, and the Muslim intellectuals started thinking about the possibility of the end of British colonial rule in India. If the English are to leave India, then whom shall they be handing over the governance of India? Muslims wanted a reestablishment of the erstwhile Muslim rule, and the Mughal rule to name it since they were the last of the Muslims ruling India. During the first freedom struggle of 1857, the Muslims succeeded in creating an 'emperor' out of the last Mughal king, Bahadur Shah Zafar, and should the movement succeeded, he would have been the emperor, thus re-establishing Mughal rule with Delhi as the Head Quarters. But the freedom movement did not succeed, and the Muslims now became faced with the problem of Democracy. They realised that if the British are to leave India, then they will do so only in favour of a democratic government, and what is more, Hindus, Sikhs and Christians: all will be in favour of democratic government.

From this begins the Muslim fear towards Hindus. Muslims started feeling that when British leave, the Hindus who are in majority shall be doing the same things which the Muslims might have done to Hindus under similar situations. They feared the Hindus are going to rule and dominate them, and destroy their religion. Muslims will have to remain slaves of Hindus, and they will have no say in any matters. And truly enough, this is what they had been doing to the Hindus for hundreds of years!

When Muslims settled in India to rule after a series of invasions, loot, plunder and forced conversion, they also brought their machinery to run a civil government as well. They spoke their language, maintained their own civil codes, and officers of their own. They ever imposed taxes on those who do not practice the religion of Islam. The Hindus did just one thing: they ran away to forests with just their scriptures and other holy books. They left all their valuables behind, gold and ornaments, but just carried their books. For a long time, these two societies had no considerable interaction to one another, and it really took long for them to come to terms with one another to co-exist. Even with all these, their co-existence used to be merely matter of fact; they lived as two compartments within the same society. The Muslims created some kind of parallel to the Hindus in all possible matters as they could. With large scale of religious conversion, during time, it became so that both Hindus and Muslims are the same people. They spoke the same language, and lived with lesser things of differences and more things of commonness. It is interesting to note how they both understand the very same language used as mother tongue. Hindus called it either as Hindi or Hindustani, but the Muslims called the same language as Urdu. The Hindus used the Indian *Dēvanagari* Script to write Hindi, which was most natural, the same script used for writing Sanskrit language. Muslims, in their despair to find a script for the same language, went straight for the Persian or Frassi Script to write the same language and called it Urdu. It is interesting to note that Indian Muslims do not have much to do with Iranians who are predominantly Shia Muslims, while Indians are Sunni majority. Still, for some mysterious reasons, the script for Urdu had become the script of Persian language.

With this self-alienating struggle from mainstream, with this hidden fear of the Hindu domination, Indian Muslims began an intellectual war with the Hindus for a separate Muslim identity and existence. The year 1857 created this fear in the minds of the Muslim intellectuals of an impending Hindu rule, and Muslim subjugation which they considered not less than any kind of salary.

One of the important premises of legitimisation of terrorism is that the Muslims are different and separate from all others. The first idea that must go into Muslim minds is that, they are different, separate etc., from others. The efforts all over was to establish a separate Muslim identity, distinct from Hindus, Sikhs, Buddhists, Jains, Jews and Christians, in spite of the fact that all these category of people are ultimately the same stock of people and no one else except the Muslims think and feel that they are different from others. 1857 saw the beginning of intellectual efforts to synthesise a Muslim identity through the efforts of many Muslim intellectuals. It is this effort that went to the extent of creating a separate Muslim state out of India, which is today's Pakistan and Bangladesh. Many Muslim intellectuals were into this, and some of the British also supported the Muslims in their efforts to create a separate identity, and subsequently, nation. The British were

not convinced about the separate Muslim identity or they are somehow distinct from all others, but the British supported the Muslims simply to prolong their colonial rule in India. They learned the policy of divide and rule only by seeing and experiencing people trying to draw distinctions and differences, they did not come to India with a blue print to divide and rule. It was a technique they picked up from the field of action, and found to be very effective with the society, no matter on what accord.

Let me list some of the important personalities, who were instrumental in creating a separate Muslim identity, which went into making a separate state for the Muslims and had caused such miseries and hardships to common people, both Hindus and Muslims.

Chapter -2-

The forerunning Separaist Intellectuals

John Bright

John bright was one of those English men, who believed that India was united only under the East India Company rule. To his eyes, India remained a fragmented area prior to the arrival of the British. He, like many other westerners, believed that India was divided into many princely states, who were often quarrelling with one another. As usual, he too failed to understand the underlying cultural unity that had ever kept this nation one, like many others. By unity, only political unity was taken to understand and not any other form of unity. John Bight's concept of unity could well be applicable to the unity within the erstwhile Soviet Union, which was kept united through the force of Communism politically, and it had to fall apart the moment the political power of communism ended. His anxiety of India falling apart is well spelt out in the speech he made in the British house of the Commons on the 24th of June, 1858. 1857 revolt started the idea of transferring powers from East India Company to the Crown, and there was a debate in the British Parliament introducing a bill to that effect. John Bright was speaking for the bill, and he further suggested that India should be divided into five presidencies, each equal in power, with own councils, financial and revenue system, police and military. He had even suggested the names of those five provinces as Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Agra and Lahore. It is interesting to see what he says about this:

"If that were to go on for a century or more, there would be five or six presidencies of India built up into so many compact states; and if at any future period the sovereignty of Englad should be withdrawn, we should leave so many presidencies built up and firmly compacted together, each able to support its own independence and its own government; and we should be able to say we had not left the country a prey to that anarchy and discord which I believe to be inevitable if we insist on holding those vast territories with the idea of building them up into one great empire" (1)

John Bright is typical of the western epistemological perspective. Perhaps it was much amazing to him that how this nation is held together, as the epistemology of such perceptions do not have any tools to understand the phenomenon that is India, which is actually held together from time immemorial not just from any external force of unity, on the contrary, from an inherent and lasting phenomenon of cultural unity, which is called in Sanskrit '*Sanātana*' implying permanency. India has a concept of '*Dharma*' which could roughly be translated as an omni vehicle of 'righteousness'. It could be perceived that in every aspect of life, thoughts and action, Indians still do care a lot about the bearing of this *Dharma* on an average. All these and more, the inherent spirituality which is nothing short of a longing to transcendence on a final analysis guides and thus unites Indians, and keep them unified internally. As a matter of fact, if India was simply an assemblage of many princely states, and the British unified India into one large nation for the sake of their rule, then John Bright and many others could have been more than correct, the moment the military power that keeps it together withdraws, this nation could have simply collapsed and

fragmented into all kinds of compartments. And indeed, this did not happen, even after several decades after the colonial rulers had gone, leaving the nation poor and miserable, and in spite of the troubles and turmoil this nation had undergone. However, this aspect was unavailable to people like John Bright, and their convictions of India falling apart remained. We can see him repeating this on and on:-

“But how long does England propose to govern India? No body answers that question, and nobody can answer it. Be it 50, 100, or 500 years, does any man with the smallest glimmering of common sense believe that so great a country, with its twenty different nations and its twenty languages, can ever be bound up and consolidated into one compact and enduring empire? I believe such a thing to be utterly impossible. We must fail in the attempt if ever we make it, and we are bound to look into the future with reference to that point.” (2)

Indeed it was impossible for him to think of India in any united form. For him, this nation was some how together, in spite of its ‘20 languages’ which, according to him makes 20 nations within India. It was only natural for him to think that it was the British who had been keeping this ‘impossible’ assemblage together, and they had to continuously struggle to keep it so. One small carelessness, it all goes, and India shall fall apart. For a man from UK, which is so tiny in front of India, who hold such differences among themselves even today, unity of India is indeed some wild dream. This is the epistemological differences of culture and knowledge systems, while one set sees differences as precipitating and vibrant; the others understand differences as only apparent, with the principle of an underlying unity.

Undoubtedly, this unity of *Bhārat* had been proved through history, and tested through time. When one fails to comprehend this, one should just look at history, and try to compare the ‘proceedings’ from history with the claim of Indian epistemology. It may be hard for one to just understand, but it is also so empirical that one can not dispute it. Unfortunately, culture can not be empirically demonstrated through scientific experiments and laboratory techniques.

There is an interesting example from religion which could be compared here. A comparison between Christianity and Hinduism, and the concept of transcendence, therein. It is salvation in the Christian theology and Liberation (*Mōkṣa*) in the Hindu theology. Salvation is ‘given’ through an act of God’s grace, and Moksha, Liberation, is individually earned, or attained. In *Mōkṣa*, god has absolutely no role to play; it becomes rather the right of the individual concerned. On the contrary, it is unthinkable for Christian theology that redemption, or salvation is possible without the merciful grace from God. Here this creates a predicament of comprehension, for both Hindus and Christians alike. And the epistemological differences are also like this, it also creates a predicament of comprehension, a paradox in itself, on a much larger level and scale.

The worry of India’s disunity and fragmentation was not any passing thought with Bright. We see him repeating the same idea with utmost consistency. On the 11th of December 1877, Bright was speaking to the Indian association in the town hall of Manchester, and we find him repeating what he had predicted in 1858. To quote him:-

“And thus if the time should come- and it will come- I agree with Lord Lawrence that no man who examines the question can doubt that some time it must come- when the power of England, from

some cause or other, is withdrawn from India, then each one of these states would be able to sustain itself as a compact, as a self governing community. You would have five or six great states there, as you have five or six great states in Europe; but that would be a thousand times better than our being withdrawn from it now when there is no coherence among these twenty nations, and when we would find the whole country, in all probability, lapse into chaos and anarchy, and into sanguinary and interminable warfare. I believe that it is our duty not only to govern India well now for our own sake and to satisfy our own conscience, but so to arrange its government and so to administer it that we should look forward to the time - which may be distant, but not be so remote - when India will have to take up her own government, and administer it in her own fashion. I say he is no statesman- he is no man actuated with high moral sense with regard to our great and terrible moral responsibility, who is not willing thus to look ahead, and thus to prepare for circumstances which may come sooner than we think, and sooner than any of us hope for, but which must come at some not very distant date. By doing this, I think we should be endeavoring to make amends for the original crime upon which much of our powers in India is founded, and for the many mistakes which have been made by men whose intentions have been good. I think it is our duty, if we can, to approach this great question in this spirit, and to try rightly to discharge the task committed to us, as the government and rulers of the countless and helpless millions of that country" (3)

Evidently, John Bright (and many others like him) was working on India with a European model. Their belief that European model is the best and the only right one convinced them to reduce all other societies of their experience into their concepts of European or more specifically, their own independent model society to which they might be belonging. We saw such mistakes happening in history repeatedly. Precisely, this was the spirit behind the Missionaries, that added to their zeal, that became popular as the Missionary zeal. These people were convinced that they are just doing the right thing, and by Christianising they were more than sure that they are doing a great service to mankind. Even when they picked up the Africans as slaves to trade on them, they were comforted in their thoughts that as they gave them Christianity, they also gave them civilisation. The premise, 'we are right and you are wrong', develops into 'we are the only ones right', and 'you are essentially wrong'. Thus it became mandatory for others to follow those who are essentially right just by virtue of their being the necessarily correct ones..

Unfortunately, this is not a bygone phenomenon. Tenets of a so called European model is still haunting the world, in every field, and more so in academic world especially of the erstwhile colonies. Academic credentials are evaluated against European journals, and publications in them. What ever it may be, if published in Europe, becomes celebrations. The merits of what is done at home are hardly looked into. There are some colonial minded people who speak of being progressive, Communism and revolution, Critical theories, Positivism and deconstruction, Structure and like things, but in essence, they blindly swallow what is disgorged in the West as progressive, critical, positive and so on. How is one to describe them? Communist progressives under communist colonisation? Miserables under oppression from Communist bourgeoisie? Exploited through a theory of a dialectics of impossibility? And what is more, the sighs they heave leaves pollution from soulless condition, which is soporific as opium, and today, communism had become the opium of the people in many such societies!

Such is the colonial mentality with some. Ravindra Nath Tagore gets a Nobel Prize when his poem is translated into English. Many of his other poetries are better than '*Gītāñjali*' and there used to be poets like him, or even better than him who were not known to outside world. Mahatma Gandhi was already popular in Europe, so when he came to India, he was instantly popular. But Gandhiji followed the advice of Gokhale, of observing and keeping quiet for some good time, before making any opinion and speaking out. And why blaming Bright alone for a European model, when there are many who run after European models whether good or bad, just for the reason that either they are unable to create a model of their own, or simply do not want to appreciate what is at home.

John Bright had seen and understood India through an epistemology available to him and made his assessments and evaluations. It took a *Swāmi Vivēkānanda* and his Chicago address in the world parliament of religions for the Western Missionaries to realise their foolishness of sending Missionaries to India to 'civilise' and 'spiritualise' Indians, and what is then realised had soon become forgotten. This idea of Bright had gone a long way in shaping the separatist thoughts among the Muslims. Indeed it was convenient for them to look at India as an assemblage of twenty nations, who are some how kept together. Later, some Muslim historians had argued that the first ever unity of India came from the Muslim rule in India. Dr.KK Aziz says:- " India had been a conglomeration of nations, peoples, religions, and races since none knew when. The imperial sword of the Turkish Mughal had imposed an orderly arrangement on these disparate elements, but as soon as the Mughal will faltered, anarchy and disunity returned to plague this vast land. The British rescued it from complete disaster and chaos."(4). The Muslim intellectuals were to legitimise their demands for a separate Muslim nation from India in the event of their inability to Islamise the entire India even through a long Muslim rule. John Bright and his idea of India as an assemblage of twenty nations helped the Muslim historians and intellectuals to argue that the division of India was a most natural outcome, and it had to be so, and they still wish to go on saying that some day or the other, this nation is bound to fall apart. They would say that the Muslims only played a role that is most natural to them.

Sayyid Ahmad Khan

Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan is one of the most outstanding intellectual and personality among early Indian Muslims. He was an educationist, writer, orator and a person with full religious belief and practice. On his part, he had stood for the Indian Muslims whole heartedly, with full commitment and most earnestly, for his entire life. Interestingly, (perhaps it is the way) most of the oppositions for this person came from none other than the Muslims, on various accounts. Initially, he was also among other Indian leaders for the general wellbeing of all Indians under the British rule. But soon these were to be so reversed, and eventually we find Sayyid Ahmad Khan becoming an autochthone of separatism and a Muslim nation theory.

The change in Sayyid Ahmad Khan can be traced to early 1860s. The context was Urdu agitation by the Muslims. Both Hindus and Muslims in India spoke the same language, which could be called Hindustani, or Hindi. Hindus wrote the language in the *Dēvanāgarī* script, a script which

was always available in India, the script in which Sanskrit language is written. Muslims, some how made a taboo of the script of *Dēvanāgarī*, as it was in the same script all the sacred books of the Hindus are written. To substitute the script of *Dēvanāgarī*, the Muslims found another script, which is neither Arabic nor Turkish, but Persian. There is no logic in their finding Persian as a substitute script for *Dēvanāgarī*, as Indian Muslims have nothing much to do with Persians, the Iranians, as compared to both Arabs and Turks. In case of Arabic, it is the language in which their holy book the Quran is written and all Muslims in the entire world are supposed to pray in that language only. So if they selected the Arabic script, it would have been ideal substitute for *Dēvanāgarī*, in which the Hindus wrote their holy scripts. But this did not happen. If they were to opt for Turkish, then also there would have been some justice, as the Indian Muslims wish to establish their lineage with the Turkish Muslims who came in as invaders to India and subsequently settled to rule. But, we find the Indian Muslims going just for Persian script, which is supposed to be far flung. The Persians are Shia Muslims, and Indians are predominantly Sunni Muslims, who maintain good amount of difference among themselves. When we discuss about Jamaluddin Afghani, this becomes an interesting point to note. However, it so happened that the Indian Muslims ended up with Persian script to write their mother tongue, just because they obstinately wanted to be different from the Hindus, who are actually the same people as the Muslims, at least given history and geography!

Althaf Husain Hali, the biographer of Sayyid Ahmad Khan narrates an incident from Sayyid Ahmad's life to show that how the Urdu language agitation had made him a different man. Hali quotes a conversation between Sayyid Ahmad and one Mr. Shakespeare, who was the then commissioner of Benares, which took place in 1867. "During these days, when the Hindi – Urdu controversy was going on in Benares, one day I met Mr. Shakespeare who was posted there as Divisional Commissioner. I was saying some thing about the education of Muslims, and Mr. Shakespeare was listening with an expression of amazement, when, at last, he said, 'This is the first occasion when I have heard you speak about the progress of the Muslims alone. Before this, you were always keen on the welfare of your countrymen in general'. I said, 'Now I am convinced that both these nations will not join wholeheartedly in anything. At present there no hostility between the two communities, but on account of the so called educated people, it will increase immediately in future. He who lives will see.' Mr. Shakespeare thereupon said, 'I am also extremely sorry, but I am confident about the accuracy of this prophecy.'" (5)

Sayyid Ahmad was slowly evolving from within towards the two nation theory that had eventually divided India. On several other occasions, he had consistently maintained that Hindus and Muslims can no longer live together. When the British were planning to give some amount of self governance to Indians through election to representative institutions, Sayyid Ahmad had opposed it vehemently. He feared that the Hindu majority is going to sideline the Muslim minority. Precisely this was the reason why most of the Muslim leadership went against democracy during those days. I heard people arguing today that Muslims are against democracy through a different logic inherent in them, which may be a different case, but in those days, their reason to be anti democratic came from the fear of a Hindu majority rule. But cleverly, he argued the case in the following manner:-

"India, a continent in itself, is inhabited by [a] vast population of different races and different creeds: the rigour of religious institutions has kept even neighbours apart: the system of caste is still dominant and powerful. In one and the same district the population may consist of various creeds and various nationalities, and whilst one section of the population commands wealth and commerce, the other may possess learning and influence. One section may be numerically larger than the other, and the standard of enlightenment which one section of the community has reached may be far higher than that attained by the rest of the population. One community may be fully alive to the importance of securing representation on the local boards and district councils, whilst the other may be wholly indifferent to such matters". (6)

His arguments against democracy were from the premises that India can never be one unified society. He highlighted the philosophy of differences and proclaimed that the people living here are essentially one different from the other. In short, he was arguing for the Muslim case, as Muslims are essentially different from all others, and here, the Hindus. Towards the end of 1886, India National Congress was demanding for representative legislative councils, and Sayyid Ahmad feared that this is indicative of the possibility of a parliament in future. He became all the more worried, about the Muslims being in the minority, and started complaining that the Muslim voices will not be heard at all. His worries of the Muslims being in the minority in India, which he lamented often as the case of a permanent minority situation, came out very well through his address to the 'All India Mahommadan Educational Conference' on the 28th of December in 1887 at Lucknow. Arguing against the introduction of competitive examinations on the ground that where people are not equally 'competitive' such examinations shall be only farce, he goes on explaining:-

"Every one can understand that the first condition for the introduction of competitive examination into a country is that all people in that country, from the highest to the lowest, should belong to one nation. In such a country no particular difficulties are likely to arise. The second case is that of a country in which there are two nationalities which have become so united as to be practically one nation. England and Scotland are a case in point.....But this is not the case with our country, which is peopled with different nations. Consider the Hindus alone. The Hindus of our Province, the Bengalis of the East, and the Mahrattas of the Deccan, do not form one nation. If, in your opinion, the people of India do form one nation, then no doubt competitive examinations may be introduced; but if this be not so, then competitive examination is not suited to the country. The third case is that of a country in which there are different nationalities which are on an equal footing as regards to the competition whether they take advantage of it or not. Now, I ask you, have Mahomedans attained to such a position as regards higher English education, which is necessary for higher appointments, as to put them on a level with Hindus or not? Most certainly not. Now I take Mahomedans and Hindus of our province together, and ask whether they are able to compete with the Bengalis or not? Most certainly not. When this is the case, how can competitive examination be introduced into our country? Think for a moment what would be the result if all appointments were given by competitive examination. Over all races, not only over Mahomedans but over the Rajas of high position and the brave Rajputs who have not forgotten the swords of their ancestors, would be placed as ruler a Bengali who at sight of table knife would crawl under his chair. There would remain no part of the country we should see at the tables of justice and authority and face except those [sic.] of Bengalis. I am delighted to see the Bengalis making

progress, but the question is – what would be the result of the administration of the country? Do you think that the Rajput and the fiery Pathan, who are not afraid of being hanged or of encountering the swords of the police or the bayonets of the army, could remain in peace under the Bengalis? This would be the outcome of the proposal if accepted..... Now, let us suppose the Viceroy's council made in this manner [through a election by the people]. And let us suppose first of all we have universal suffrage, as in America, and that everybody, chamars [a very low caste] and all have votes. And first suppose that all Mahomedan electors vote for Mahomedan member and all Hindu electors for a Hindu member, and now count how many votes the Mahomedan member has and how many the Hindu. It is certain the Hindu members will have four times as many because their population is four times as numerous. Therefore we can prove by mathematics that there will be four votes for the Hindu to every one vote for the Mahomedan. And how can the Mahomedan guard his interests? It would be like a game of dice, in which one man had four dice and the other only one. In the second place, suppose that the electorate be limited. Some method of qualification must be made; for example, that people with a certain income shall be electors. Now, I ask you, O Mahomedans! Weep at your condition! Have you such wealth that you can compete with the Hindus? Most certainly not. Suppose, for example, that an income of Rs. 5,000 a year be fixed on, how many Mahomedans will there be? Which party will have the larger number of votes? I put aside the case that by a rare stroke of luck a blessing comes through the roof and some Mahomedan is elected. In the normal case no single Mahomedan will secure a seat in the Viceroy's Council Now, we will suppose a third kind of election. Suppose a rule to be made that a suitable number of Mahomedans and a suitable number of Hindus are to be chosen. I am aghast when I think on what grounds this number is likely to be determined. Of necessity, a proportion to total population will be taken. So there will be one member for us to every four for Hindus. No other condition can be laid down. Then they will have four votes, and we shall have one" (7)

It was none other than Sayyid Ahmad himself who founded the Mahomedan Educational Conference, and the purpose of which is explicit. On the face of it, it was all for the welfare of the Muslims in India, but it was directed towards differences and hate Philosophy to the Hindus. Ironically, at one point we see him saying that the Hindus also do not have anything in common to be one, both cast wise and geographically, and there are many differences among the Hindus. But when it comes to people's representation and electoral councils, he treats the entire Hindus trans languages, geography and caste as one single unit to say that the Hindus shall only vote another Hindu. From this he evolves the ratio of 4:1, four for Hindus, and one for Muslims. One could see him giving some sort of a warning to the Muslims of the coming Hindu rule, which evidently makes the Muslims unsecured and desperate. The feeling of being alienated, dominated, and the feeling of extreme insecurity, all these were driven deep into the Muslim minds to turn them against any others, and to stop interacting with them. Sayyid Ahmad was slowly making Hindus the enemies of the Muslims, and convincing the Muslims that they are different from the Hindus, and not only that, but also that the Muslims are a separate "Nation". Now the Muslims will have to work hard towards protecting their religion, and everything, at any cost. Whatever action performed and sacrifices made for the 'noble' cause of Islam shall be rewarded by the God almighty himself, and to suffer martyrdom shall just be the desideratum. Now, what more is further requisite to see these things as the beginning of Jihadi Terrorism?

The Indian National Congress was formed in the year 1885. It was formed actually by an English man, Allan Octavian Hume, who is popularly known as AO Hume. Hume was a British Officer posted in India, and it had actually confused me in my early school days as to why this British officer went for such a thing! Definitely his masters must have become most unhappy, and this could have risked his job. There is no specific indication from any corner that this man had somehow loved India and Indian people to do such a thing, or that he had actually become lured into Indian Philosophy or the Upanishads to become a Hindu. Nothing of these kind, he suddenly appeared out of the blue to make the Indian National Congress Party. I also had another confusion in my early school days, the history told that one Nathuram Vinayak Godse killed the Bappu. Why? When I asked my teacher, she simply told me that 'you will only understand when you grow up'. That was easily asked question and easily answered, but in case of Hume, the question of why Hume went into making the Congress did not occur only, then. Later, I understood that this has a history.

The 1857 struggle against the alien rule of British East India Company, that *Swatantravīr Savarkar* called as the first struggle of independence created much difficulties for the British East India Company and the British Government. There were so many people up against the British, so many struggles in all parts of India, and no common organisation or common leader to that. All different movements had their own distinct methodologies and leadership as well as causes, but with just one goal of ousting the alien who were stealing and looting Indian wealth as well as enslaving the people of India. For the rulers, it was all big confusion, and they did not know who to talk to, or whom to address, should they desire some sort of discussions or settlement. They were unable to even think of making meaningful talks to some one or the other, to somehow get the struggle settled. There were so many leaders, and so many Kings or Queens in the battle. Most of them would not even bother to talk to the Colonial oppressors, leave alone discussions of settlements.

With the 1857 phenomenon, British Government took over the rule from the East India Company, and did some fine post-mortems. What they felt as an immediate need is the presence of some Indian organisation with definite leadership who shall eventually lead any movements should there be one in the future. And they nefariously wanted the British educated Indians to hold most leadership, so that in the event of any problems, they could function with similar logic and categories to communicate and of course, to make them see the reason as the British see. What an amazing programme! And it did work right through till the independence of India in 1947, as well as after the independence. That is why the nationalists said, the white oppressors got replaced with brown oppressors, and the situations continued same for the people of India.

Hume was the British officer selected and appointed for this precise purpose. That is why he suddenly appeared out of the blue to make the Indian National Congress Party, with leaders who shall be obedient to the masters. And Hume was no benefactor to the Indian people at all. There are many incidents from history of the Congress approach to the Colonial rulers. When the Prince of Wales visited India, Ravindranath Tagore wrote out a coy poetry in his praise, which was recited or sung in the Congress session in Calcutta. The poem praises the visiting prince as the ruler of the minds of all Indians and the fortune giver as well as destiny of Indian nation. This poem is known to all, it is the "Jana Gana Mana", which had become the National Anthem of the Union

of India as against the proposed *Vandē Mātaram* as the Muslims objected to *Vandēmātaram*. This is one example to the Congress attitude, which was actually designed by the British. Today, Jananganamana is the national anthem of India, and it commands respect from any Indian, and insofar as any poem whatever it might actually mean is the National anthem, it has to be respected with heart and soul, just because it is the National Anthem.

Subsequently, the Congress had become an organ for India's struggle for independence, and in post – independent India, it had become the single largest political party to rule India for real long time. But right from day one, Sayyid Ahmad was not in support of the Congress. He had been very sceptical, and looked at Congress as an organ deceptively designed to protect and maintain the Hindu interests. He was convinced that the Congress only pretends to stand for all people of India, in reality, it is nothing but a Hindu outfit, as Hindus are the majority in this nation. As a result, he vehemently forbids the Muslims to have anything to do with the Congress, no matter who says what. (Indeed, today people will laugh at the scepticism of Sayyid Ahmad, after all these years of Indian independence!). Look at how he thinks of the Congress:-

“The Congress is in reality a civil war without arms. The object of a civil war is to determine in whose hands the rule of the country shall rest. The objects of the promoters of the National Congress is that the Government of India should be English in the name only, and that the internal rule of the country should be entirely in their own hands. They do not publicly avow that they wish it for themselves: they speak in the name of the whole people of India; but they very well know that the Mahomedans will be unable to do anything, and so the rule of the country will be monopolized by them. We also like a civil war. But not a civil war without arms. If [the] Government want to give over the internal rule of the country from its own hands into those of the people of India, then we will present a petition that, before doing so, they pass a law of competitive examination, namely, that that nation which passes first in this competition will be given the rule of the country; but that in this competition we will be allowed to use the pen of our ancestors, which is in truth the true pen for writing the decree of sovereignty. Then he who will pass first in this shall rule the country. If my friends the Bengalis pass first then indeed we will pick up their shoes and put them on our heads; but without such a civil war we do not want to subject our nation to be trodden under their feet. Let my Hindu fellow countrymen and Bengali brothers understand well that my chief wish is that all the nations of India should live in peace and friendship with one another; but that friendship can last so long only as one does not try to put another in subjection” (8)

This is an explicit challenge to physical civil wars between the Hindus and Muslims. By his expression “using the pen of our ancestors” he out rightly means the methods of war fares conducted by the Muslim invaders of India. The Muslim invasions of India, the loots, plunders, and asking people to choose between Islamic sword and religious conversion to Islam. Indeed it is ridiculous for Indian Muslims to consider the Muslim invaders as their “ancestors”. It is a real matter of fact that the Indian Muslims are essentially Indians, the same people who were forced to choose Islam once upon a time, and as a matter of fact, their ancestors must have become Mahomedans through tears and torture! Ironically, even very learned people like Sayyid Ahmad also takes pride in such things, that their ancestors are not Indians, and it is a matter of deep interest as to how and why they stop reasoning at certain point, refusing not to go beyond at all. They speak of their ancestry up to the Muslim invaders, and if pressed, may be up to the Arabs.

Indeed, it is one of the greatest treachery to the real ancestors of them, who were all Hindus, compelled to become Muslims through pain and agony, and most unwillingly. How ever, such statements and attitudes will strongly go into the minds of common Muslims, who will only be too happy to pick up their daggers to behead the Hindus. After all they were the words of 'wisdom' spoken by one of their most learned person! The seeds of modern Jihadi terrorism were already sprouting in the Common Muslim minds.....

But then, this is India. There will always be Muslims who are also well educated who do not fall pray to negativities and Islamic fundamentalism leading to terrorism. When Sayyid Ahmad Khan called the Muslims not to join the Congress with the plea that Congress is standing for 'Hindu Nation', there were some others who wanted to drive reason into the mind of Sayyid Ahmad. Badruddin Tyebji was one such Muslim, who kept pleading with Sayyid Ahmad. He wrote letters to Sayyid Ahmad asking him not to be negative and support the congress to fight the British for India's freedom. Tyebji was perhaps hopeful that Sayyid might realise that he was being too narrow and fundamental. But this had an effect which was contrary to the expectations of Tyebji as well as other Congress men.

On the 14th of March 1888, Sayyid Ahmad Khan delivered two long speeches at Meerut. One was in the morning, and the other was in the evening. These speeches were completely destroying what ever hope any Congress men had along with Tyebji. It is worth quoting both the speeches at length, to make explicit the kind of fire filling by Sayyid Ahmad against Indian nation in particular and Hindus in general. The morning speech:-

"It has never been my wish to oppose any people or any nation who wish to make progress, and who have raised themselves up to the rank to which they wish to attain and for which they are qualified. But my friends the Bengalis have made a most unfair and unwarrantable interference with my nation, and therefore, it is my duty to show very clearly what this unwarrantable interference has been, and to protect my nation from the evils that may arise from it Our Mahomedan nation has hitherto sat silent. It was quite indifferent as to what the Babus of Bengal, the Hindus of these provinces, and the English and Eurasian inhabitants of India might be doing. But they have now been wrongly tampering with our nation. In some districts they have brought pressure to bear on Mahomedans to make them join the Congress. I am sorry to say that they never said anything to these people who are powerful and are actually Raises [rich and influential persons] and are counted the leaders of the nation; but they brought unfair pressure to bear on such people as could be subjected to their influence We know very well the people of our own nation, and that they have been induced to go [to attend the Congress session] either by pressure, or by folly, or by love of notoriety, or by poverty When matters took such a turn, then it was necessary that I should warn my nation of their misrepresentations in order that others should not fall into the trap; and that I should point out to my nation the few who went to Madras, went by pressure, or for some temptation, or in order to help their profession, or to gain notoriety, or were bought Gentlemen, what I am about to say is not only useful for my own nation, but also for my Hindu brothers of these provinces, who from some wrong notions have taken part in the congress These proposals of the Congress are extremely inexpedient for a country which is inhabited by two different nations, who drink from the same well, breath the air of the same city, and depend each on the other for its life. To create animosity between them is

good neither for peace, nor for the country, nor for the town Now, suppose all the English and the whole English army were to leave India, taking with them all the cannon and their splendid weapons and everything, then who would be rulers of India? Is it possible that under these circumstances two nations – the Mahomedans and the Hindus – could sit on the same throne and remain equal in power. Most certainly not. It is necessary that one of them should conquer the other and thrust it down. To hope that both could remain equal is to desire the impossible and the inconceivable If we join the political movement of the Bengalis our nation will reap loss, for we do not want to become subjects of the Hindus instead of the subjects of the ‘people of the Book’.” (9)

The extent of Islamic fundamentalism spelt out by Sayyid Ahmad as pure venom is amazing. His one speech is sufficient to drive a common Muslim crazy to pick up weapons of destruction against a non Muslim. He clearly says that Muslims can not live with non Muslims, and if there are non Muslims in a society, they will have to be over powered and subjugated. Sayyid also speaks about a “Dar-UI-Islam” which is a concept of Islamic nation or rule. He too, in spite of what ever might be his education, is eventually driven by that Islamic idea of Islamic rule or nation. When this is understood, it becomes easy for one to understand his ideas of Muslims as a separate nation in India, which he now keeps repeating and trying hard to drive into Muslim minds. He speaks to the Indian Muslims that just because they are Muslims, they have to be different from the Hindus and all other non Muslims. He tells the Indian Muslims that they can not live with the Hindus and share a nation. He instructs the Indian Muslims that Islam is a nation, and the Muslims are a separate nation. He spells out the idea that if the Hindus and Muslims come together, then, only one can become the ruler, and therefore, one has to subjugate the other through might of course. Here, Sayyid Ahmad becomes really the descendent of the barbaric Muslim invaders, which he often proudly calls as his ancestry! One must be able to work out the status enjoyed by Sayyid Ahmad among the Muslims in those days. He was a very well learned man, educationist, scholar, and so on, a very good friend of the British, etc. his words could be real words of authority to common Muslims. But then, undoubtedly, he had lead the common Indian Muslims into Islamic fundamentalism which resulted in today’s Jihadi terrorism. It is only a matter of common sense to see that Taliban or what ever shall only be a natural out come from such kinds of attitude as well as ideology. This is what confuses the world even today, what is primary? Ones faith system or ones culture and nationality? What ought to be primary is ones culture, which is trans faith system, from which the national culture evolves. India and the Hindu religion itself is the best available example to this. The Hindu religion itself is a co existence of many faith systems with considerable differences in rituals and practices, some times contradicting even one another. As I had initially made it clear, the epistemology of togetherness as against the epistemology of differences makes this Hindu religion as one, through many inherent different faith system, rituals and practices. They are all different from one another, but then, they are all ultimately one, and no differences remains. Indians had never given primacy to their faith systems and practices etc. over and above their Philosophy, which had formed the edifice of their culture. The simple expression, “Ekam Sat: Vipra Bahudha Vadanti” makes this attitude clear. (There is or there can be only one truth [God], but the scholars call it through different names, and approach it through different methods). Long before the Indian scholars had realised the folly of looking for separate God or gods as ultimate and final, they had explicitly stated that there can only be one reality; if any!

Just look at Sayyid Ahmad: he tells the Indian Muslims that they can not co exist with non Muslims, he tells them that they are a separate nation, he tells them that the nationalism of the Congress is a Hindu nationalism, and Muslims will only be subjugated by the majority Hindus in the days to come. He speaks about the Muslims who joined the Congress as those who are either misguided or mistaken, and the like. In one word, Sayyid Ahmad and such people could have been born in India and lived here through generations, but the way they had been able to understand Islam did not make them Indians, and they became now alienated Indians through Islamic fundamentalism. Even the smallest wind from Indian epistemology had never passed through their closed minds.

Finally, he makes an interesting suggestion; if at all the Muslims are to be ruled by some non Muslims then let it be the Christians as against the Hindus, who are, after all, "people of the Book"! Very cleverly, he was hinting towards his suggestion of prolonging the British rule in India which to his mind is much better than a free democratic India which can not be an Islamic nation. (Perhaps it is better not to think about Pakistan and its present day state, which is the ultimate result of his dream of an Islamic nation.....)

Let us now 'listen' to the evening speech from Sayyid Ahmad Khan, on the same day, at same place, let us not forget that the Muslims are a nation which he had established in the morning:-

"My friends, what is now the state of our nation? All the Musalman families of Hindustan are falling and are being ruined At the present time unless my nation unite and concentrate its forces, and collect all the requisites of education, and take the fact to heart that now without spending money it can not acquire education, it will be impossible for it to become highly educated. More over, the old method was not adapted to the growth of those feelings of honour and national sympathy which are essential for our national progress The second thing that I wish to see established in our people is national feeling and sympathy; and this can not be created unless they boys of our nation read together. At this moment, when all of us Mahomedans have come together the assembly itself has an effect on our hearts, and an involuntary emotion gives birth to the thought – 'Our Nation', 'Our Nation' – but when we separate the effect vanishes Before all things, my nation should preserve its honour and its self-respect, and should give such training to its children as will cultivate these feelings I pray the almighty that national sympathy may arise in our people, and that the nation may give help, and may complete the glorious task we have undertaken for its improvement. I beg of you also to join in this prayer."
(10)

Such was the teachings of Sayyid Ahmad Khan to the Muslims of India. Hence, it could be logically argued that he was much effective in filling the common Indian Muslim minds with poison and hatred towards Hindus in particular and all non Muslims in general. He had effectively made the Indian Muslims suffering from insecurity and despair, a state of mind from which they could be made to do anything. He was effective in creating and driving such spurious logic into their minds, the results of which had shown in subsequent years through many separatist movements. He had used Education and knowledge with such narrowness that he had made his creations of the MAO College and the Aligarh Muslim University as instruments of separatism, which had culminated into terrorism of contemporary days. Even the ideologies of the Taliban could be traced to these kinds

of intellectual legitimisation of separatism and fundamentalism. What more can any one expect from common Indian Muslims? To their eyes, Sayyid Ahmad was an authority, a highly educated man and a visionary, whose words were truly the words of 'wisdom'. How could any one convince these Indians that people like Sayyid Ahmad carried the spirit of the invading Muslims, of destruction and hatred? He himself had failed to transcend the barbaric approach within himself with all his polished civilisation and education.

Jamaluddin 'Afghani'

Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan is indeed a celebrity in the Muslim world. But Jamaluddin is also a celebrity to some, who may be termed the hard cores. To those who are not given to fundamentalism, if Sayyid's teachings were divisive, then Jamaluddin's speeches were destructive. Jamaluddin is known as both 'Afghani' and 'Al – Afghani', more so as 'Afghani' where the Arabic definite article is not in use.

The name 'Afghani' is in fact a cover, some kind of protective sheath to Jamaluddin. This sounds like a person from Afghanistan, but in reality, he is not. Jamaluddin is originally from Iran, and spoke the language of Frassi as mother tongue like other Iranians. He had nothing to do with Afghanistan, or the language spoken there, Peshtoon. In fact he had visited Afghanistan only once, when the Amir of Afghanistan actually threw him out of that nation. Yet, Jamaluddin continued as Afghani, and gave the impression that he belonged to Afghanistan. Jamaluddin himself gave the impression that he was born in Afghanistan and he belonged to Afghanistan. Muhammad Iqbal, who is widely read and accepted as an authority believed that Jamaluddin belonged to Afghanistan and he was born there. (11) But the fact that Jamaluddin had nothing at all to do with Afghanistan had been made explicit through later studies, though many scholars especially in Pakistan do not wish to accept this. (12). Jamaluddin had visited Afghanistan only once, during 1866 to 1868 as a matter of fact. (13)

It is interesting to note as to why Jamaluddin used to be so eager to present himself as an Afghan, and hide his real origin from Tehran, Iran. Jamaluddin's operating area with his Pan Islamic dream had to be India, Turkey, Egypt, Afghanistan and such places. Muslims of these areas are predominantly Sunni Muslims, and Iranians are predominantly Shia Muslims. With such philosophies of differences running among the Muslims, Jamaluddin's Shia origin could have become a great handicap, and the Sunnis were not going to accept him. Hence he deliberately lied to the Sunni Muslims to make them believe that he too was a Sunni, indirectly through saying that he belonged to Afghanistan, where Muslims are predominantly Sunnis. This itself is indicative of how cunning Jamaluddin could be, and also how ambitious with his Pan Islamism. We shall also make an attempt to look at how secretive as well as ambitious used to be his Pan Islamism, which to my mind was not for the sake of Islam as such, but for Jamaluddin to become an emperor, like Humayun in India. For him, Islam was more of an instrument for this desideratum, and had he lived in a different period in time, perhaps he also could have founded an empire like the Mughals.....

Jamaluddin's first visit to India was in 1854, and he stayed in India till 1857. (14). His second visit to India is reported to be in 1859, but we do not have much information on this visit. In 1869 he came to India for the third time, and this time he was being expelled from Afghanistan by Amir Sher Ali. (15) In India also he could not stay for more than a month, since the British had deported him to Egypt, and did not allow him to make contacts with other Indian Muslims.

Then he came to India by the beginning of 1881 as the official records show, (16) But the Afshar documents say that he was already in Hyderabad from April 1880 to November 1881 (17). Jamaluddin's India visits were important for the Muslims separatism. Albeit he wished to begin his Pan Islamic philosophy to be put into practice with India as the centre, he was also making feel the Muslims that they are a different lot from all others. One Pakistani student, Sharif al – Mujahid who wrote his Masters dissertation on Jamaluddin says that Jamaluddin found India to be a "fertile soil to plant his ideas" and with this intention he had made a "deep impression on the people he came across, orienting some of his ideas, and making disciples of others" (18)

Bipen Chandra Pal observes correctly. He speaks of the coming of Jamaluddin as "inspired with the vision of an all world confederacy of Princes and Peoples of Islam", and "passed through India inoculating many a leader of Muhammadan thought in Calcutta and Bombay and other cities with this new virus" of his dream of the Islamic empire through the philosophy of Pan Islamism. As a result, "a new self-consciousness of our Muslim neighbours, a new conceit of separate communal interests, and a new desire to revive, in the name of purity, the old iconoclastic spirit of the Islamic faith and thereby to work a new religious cleavage between the Mahomedans and their Hindu neighbours. The political conflicts between educated Hindus and Moslems were attribute to the natural jealousy of rival aspirants to office and rank, and the religious feuds to a desire to revive the original ideals of Islam and recognise the old propagandist activities of that faith. But nobody ever suspected these as the slow and silent development of seed that Jamal-ud-Din had sown in his confidential conferences with the Muslim intellectuals of Calcutta and other places" (19). We find him repeating the same thoughts, in retrospective, after many years. "before Jamal-ud-Din's advent, the educated Indian Mohammedans, particularly in Bengal, had been loyally cooperating with their Hindu fellow subjects for the common advancement of national political interests. But with his visit they commenced to draw themselves away from political activities of their Hindu fellow subjects until gradually a wide gulf was created between the Hindu and Muslim intellectuals in the country in regard to our national endeavours" (20)

Jamaluddin wrote several articles and gave many lectures during his stay in India. All of them were in Persian language. Some of them were published. Six articles were published in a Deccan Hyderabad journal, named "Mu'allim-i-Shafiq", edited by Muhibb Husain. These six articles and another five articles were published in book form as collected articles of Jamaluddin, from Calcutta in 1884, under the name "Maqalat-i-Jamaliyyeh".

These collections are reported to be the only original published work of Jamaluddin about India, during that period. He had been deft, and has effectively concealed his aggressive Pan Islamic ideas as if to make an entry into the Muslims minds for a start. How ever, there is no hiding about separatism and Muslims being all different from others, and the questions of separate identity.

There is much myth lingering around Jamaluddin Afghani, right from the very manner he disguises his identity through a spurious name of 'Afghani'. Modern Islamic scholars chiefly associate the concept of Pan Islamism with Afghani, and often treat him as the main propounder of Pan Islamism. As a matter of fact, the idea of Pan Islamism was present in the minds of many a Muslim intellectuals, though not in any uniform pattern. Most of them had this vague notion of entire world turning into Islam, beginning with some or the other parts in the world, all with the archetype notion of Dar-ul-Islam. To what extent Jamaluddin was an explicit Pan Islamist is dubious.

Whether or not Jamaluddin was Pan Islamist, is not much of our concern, but what matters to us is what was Jamaluddin in reality. Researchers like Aziz Ahmad says that "The Urdu press of the 1870s already reveals pan-Islamic, especially pan-Ottoman, trends before Afghani's first works were published in India and long before the publication of *al-Urwa al-Wuthqa*" (21)

But then, what was this Jamaluddin so called 'Afghani'? What did he want at all? Why such stinging and indecent attacks on Sayyid Ahmad Khan in particular? (22). Jamaluddin was so animistic to Sayyid Ahmad, that he wrote a long article on him under the name "A Description on the Aghuris". The very choice of the title 'Aghuri' itself is designed at insulting and humiliating Sayyid Ahmad, as not just as an anti Muslim, but also an Aghuri. Aghuri which is actually *Aghōri*, is a name used to stand for the Tantrics in Indian tradition, both Hindu and Buddhist alike. The Tantrics are also known as *Aghōris* as well as *Kaulās*. Tantricism is one among the many techniques of transcendence developed in Indian Philosophy, which does quite the opposite of what other techniques do. While in all other techniques of transcendence insist on the control and ultimately the winning over sense organs, Tantric techniques liberate the sense organs to optimum involvement with mundaneness. The principle here is that, if a soul is genuine and is really longing for transcendence, through such involvement with mundane world in unrestricted form, the soul will soon get saturated with all the mundaneness and realise how empty and meaningless they all are. This way, one attains transcendence much quicker than the others through orthodox techniques. The Tantrics, in the process, of finding the emptiness of everything, negates their bodies and common worldly ways. This makes them indeed strange, different and at times repelling. They go about clad in ash from burning grounds where bodies are cremated; un cut hair and beard, sans cloths, and not at all clean for common standards. Muslims, in their utter un knowledge of the philosophy behind these things, treat them as miserables or untouchables. Jamaluddin who is not at all an Indian wished to call Sayyid Ahmad an Aghuri, with this intention, which indeed must be insulting to any Muslims at that time. He attacked not only Sayyid Ahmad, but also his followers. (23)

Let me quote one short paragraph from Jamaluddin to demonstrate the extent of his hatred towards Sayyid Ahmad Khan: "The dog indulges in flattery to get a bone; wags his tail; and places his head on the benefactor's feet, may he be from his own people or a foreigner. Man is worse than a dog. What a surprise! He should leave the dog miles behind in flattery and self-abasement. If he has no tail, well, he has got a beard (Sayyid had a long beard). Nasatuda-i-Marg Khan had understood this point: he was always ready, on the call of his master, to wag his beard in order to earn the crumbs of bread thrown to him. May God reward his expression of gratitude with more kindness from his masters!" (24)

Many writers from the Islamic fold believe that the hatred of Jamaluddin towards Sayyid Ahmad is based on Jamaluddin's anti imperialistic policy. Sayyid was scheming up with the British to prolong their rule in India and to get maximum for the Muslims. Since Jamaluddin was anti British and anti imperialistic, he disliked Sayyid. But this may not be the real story. We can see Jamaluddin approaching the British for a 'Muslim' alliance, in an interesting manner. He suggested for an alliance between the British, the Afghans, the Persians, the Turks, the Egyptians and the Arabs to drive the Russians out of Merv. (25). Thus at the cost of the British, he could have easily united these provinces under the name of Islam, and with their help, could have become an emperor of a great empire. But this did not work out. Later, when he was put to hardship in Turkey by the sultan for much of his misdeeds which actually was threatening the throne, we see Jamaluddin literally begging the British for help. "I am an Afghan (Cabul) and I depend on England. I have passed a great part of my life in the orient with the single aim of uprooting fanaticism, the most harmful malady of this land, of reforming society and establishing there the benefits of tolerance". (26) The British remained cleverer, and they called for the records on this man from their India office, studied them, and of course, rejected his request (27).

More strange things with Jamaluddin come from the following facts. On his Paris journal, *al-Urwa al-wuthqa*, he collaborated with the Jewish Sanua. In Constantinople he associated himself with the Babis, agnostics and atheists. In Russia, he was over friendly with the procurator of the Holy Synod, Pobedonostsev. (28) There is accusation that Jamaluddin was opposed to the Sultan Abdul Hamid of Turkey, and that he had inspired the Young Turk movement. Charles Adams insists that the "successful Young Turk movement of 1908 was prepared by agitation during the years he spent in Constantinople" (29).

Jamaluddin, along with Abduh had made a secret society with Europe as the area of operation, consisting of Paris Muslims to begin with. He started a journal from Paris, named "*al-Urwa al-wuthqa*" to this purpose. Jamaluddin gave the ideas and Abduh wrote out the text. The first issue came out on 13th March, 1884, and the last came out on 16th of October, 1884. All the 18 issues are preserved in the Bibliotheque Nationale of Paris. It is stated that this journal "was published at the expense of a number of Indian Muhammadans". (30)

But what exactly was his objective? Was Pan Islamism really the goal or some thing else? Why did he attack Sayyid Ahmad so badly? Was that just because of his so called anti imperialism and the so called con attitude to the British? Nothing is very clear about him as the name 'Afghani' itself. Most likely he comes to India following the path of the erstwhile Turk, Babur, who eventually set up an Islamic empire in India, with the dream of setting up another Islamic Empire, a Dar-ul-Islam with the support of Muslims. He rightly found India to begin with, and then slowly to spread to other areas like Egypt, Turkey, Afghanistan, and of course Iran, which is his mother land. To conceal his Shia origin, he assumes the title 'Afghani' to give the impression that he is a Peshtoon from Afghanistan. Nonetheless, he spoke and wrote mostly in Persian, and most of the Educated Indian Muslims knew Persian very well. Fortunately for Jamaluddin, these Indian Muslims were desperate to find a substitute for Sanskrit language, which they unconditionally identified with the Hindu religion, since all the *Vēdic* texts were written in Sanskrit and Hindus are using Sanskrit language in all religious aspects. Had they accepted Sanskrit as the cultural lingua franca of India, they would not have had this desperate situation of looking for a 'Muslim' language closer to India to

juxtapose Sanskrit. Indian Muslims struggled to elevate Persian to the level of Sanskrit, and thus it had become the 'official' language of the Indian Muslims, as Sanskrit was the religious language of the Hindus. They also started using the Persian script instead of the *Dēvanāgarī*. As a result, with language, Jamaluddin remained at ease, and his Shia origin could effectively be hidden.

But then, the most serious challenge to Jamaluddin came from a single person, Sayyid Ahmad Khan. Sayyid Ahmad was already established and popular, and was much more powerful and influential than Jamaluddin could ever be. Sayyid Ahmad had just one agenda in his mind, which was the well being of Indian Muslims, and possibly a re-establishment of the Muslim rule in India. Personally, he did not hope to become ruler himself. Jamaluddin had all these secret wishes, of making an empire out of the huge area beyond all existing rulers to become an Emperor. His continuous travel to varying lands indicates to this. Unfortunately for him, Jamaluddin was late in time, such opportunities used to exist some centuries before only. And that is why he kept Sayyid Ahmad as his first enemy, and attacked him with contempt and bitterness, out of frustration.

Whether or not his Pan Islamic ideas were intrinsic or instrumental, it had devastating effect among Indian Muslims. It had created separatism and mistrust in the Indian Muslim minds, which went long way into the making of modern terrorism.

Wilfred Scawen Blunt

Wilfred Scawen Blunt was another English man who supported the Muslims against the Hindus. He was sure that the future of India is hopeless, that it can just not go on as one nation. In one of the five articles written in the 'Fortnightly Review of 1881 – 82', which later was published in book form under the name 'Ideas about India', he speaks how strong the Muslims are as against the Hindus. "The strong hold of the Muhammadans in India is the North-West and there Islam is far from hopeless or disposed to perish. Intellectually the equals and morally the superiors of their Hindu neighbours, the Muhammadans of the upper Ganges Valley have not forgotten that till very lately administration of India was almost entirely in their hands and they look upon their declining fortunes as neither deserved nor irremediable" (31). So strong was his conviction that he kept repeating that India can never be one unit, and he had actually opposed the move for a representative form of self governance for India. He argues that "India is far too vast a continent and inhabited by race far too heterogeneous to make amalgamation in a single assembly possible for representatives elected on any conceivable system..... any attempt of the sort at present would find for themselves the inevitable fate of the Tower of Babel. With these provinces, and for all provincial affairs, self-government is a growing necessity, and the present age is quite capable of witnessing it in practice. I would like to see each provinces of India entirely self managed as regards to civil matters." (32)

Blunt was sure that India had to be divided, there is no possibility of India remaining together at all. Later in 1883, when he was in Calcutta, he came out explicitly as for what kind of division is to be made. He clearly suggested that India has to be divided in religious lines. "All the northern

provinces, which is predominantly Muslim, should be brought under one government, a Muslim government. All the southern provinces which are predominantly Hindu, should be brought under a Hindu government. But presumable for some time to come, British over lordship over the whole of India was to continue. Each government was to be run by Indians themselves, with complete freedom of control over civil administration, legislation and finance. But British soldiers would be stationed in each area, and through them the imperial authority would maintain its military power and guarantee the defence of the sub continent against external attack".(33)

Ian Stephens clearly speaks of Blunt anticipating Muslim separatism and a Pakistan demand for future. (34). It was Blunt who had first made the view that India must be divided as Hindu India and Muslim India. In fact he suggested that the entire northern India to become Muslim India and leave just the south for the Hindus. He had not only supported Muslim separatism which automatically supports Muslim fundamentalism and Jihad indirectly, but also put ideas into their ever fertile separatist minds that India will have to be divided in religious lines. He spoke about a Hindu India and a Muslim India to much of the delight of many a separatists. Thus, Scawen Blunt is yet another Englishman who served the interest of the Muslims and paved path to separatism and terrorism.

Muharram Ali Chisti

In the 1857 struggle of independence, the last Mughal Emperor Bahadur shah Zafar was poised as the Emperor of Delhi by the Muslims. For them, this was an indication for the return of the Muslim rule in India, and thus they supported the freedom struggle in those areas. The colonial forces crushed the struggle, and the sons of the 'poised' emperor were killed, which demoralised the aging monarchical aspirant. Sayyid Ahamad wished to put all the blame on the Hindus to declare that Muslims had nothing to do with the 1857 struggle, and he wanted to prove it to the British that it was all a Hindu struggle. He pleaded with the British for this time and again. Consequently, when Indian National Congress was formed in 1885 (though the Congress party was actually designed to work for the British interest), Sayyid and other Muslim intellectuals asked the Muslims to stay away from Congress. In reality they suspected the Congress to be a Hindu party. In fact, the Muslims were not ready to accept anything that is not Islamic, and naturally, they did not accept the Congress as well. Further, though the Muslims wanted a separate political party exclusively for the Muslims to juxtapose the Congress, Sayyid Ahamad did not want to entertain this idea, since he was sure that this shall antagonise the British, and he took to the course of appeasing and pleasing the British for winning favours for the Muslims. Jamaluddin's attack on Sayyid gets justification from this. Sayyid was not at all willing to do anything that might antagonise his 'friends', the British. He had repeated time and again that it would always be better to be under the rule of the British than that of the Hindus, and hence, the Muslims must work towards prolonging the British rule in India. Thus, from Sayyid Ahamad, any support to the question of a Muslim political party was just ruled out.

Many Muslims wanted a separate Muslim party. And it was Muharram Ali Chisti, who first openly demanded for a separate Muslim political party for the Muslims. Mawlawi Muharram Ali Chisti had founded, owned and edited a weekly from Lahore, under the name, "Rafique-i-Hind".(35) . Chisti started using this weekly to bring home the dire need of a political party for the Muslims and went on writing in that, both editorials and articles, and also made others to write in it. In 1888, Chisti went to Calcutta to meet other Muslim intellectuals to speak about the importance of a Muslim political party. He succeeded in getting many others to agree with him, and also succeeded in converting the mind of Sayyid Ameer Ali. With the help of Ameer Ali, a huge meeting was arranged in which Ameer Ali was the chairman, and Chisti explained the need of a Muslim party as well as the now popular 'two nation theory'. This meeting, and the continuous advocacy of the 'Rafique-i-Hind' had eventually made the "Muhammadan National Conference" in Calcutta in January 1889 possible.

Some of his writings are worth quoting. He argues that his intentions had always been to keep the innocent Muslims away from the devastating influence of the Congress. He asks "Is it not true that Muslim national rights are suffering due to the dominance of other nation? We repeat that if the Muslamans are prepared to submit to a life of slavery in India, then they will prove a curse to India, a disaster for that nation and a non entity in the eyes of that Government".(36)

Muslims are a separate nation, no matter where ever they are. They shall be fine, if they are in majority, but if they are not in majority, then they will feel unsecured, and shall want their own nation. At one point Chisti is universally correct: 'they will prove a curse to any nation in which they are in, and a disaster to that nation.....' And indeed; the world is slowly experiencing this!

Abdul Halim Sharar

The contributions of Abdul Halim Sharar to Muslim separatism come from his books, nearly fifty of them; apart from many articles and journalistic works. It all started with a train journey, when he was reading Sir Walter Scott's "Talesman". He was struck by the idea of European fiction writing, but what disturbed him was the way in which Islam was treated. For Indian Muslims, the Muslims were rulers for a long time, and they never had to experience anything other than respect and acceptance. All others were subjugated as mere subjects, or secondary to Islam. It was the British rule that changed this situation, but then, they were not alone in it. The majority people, the Hindus were also with them. The British seemed to have treated the Hindus as equals for most purposes, but this was not acceptable to the Muslims. They wanted to be above, and wanted upper hands, and for no particular reason. The Muslim wish for wanting upper hand and special place always above the Hindus must have come from many reasons. First of all, the Muslims were the rulers for long time, and they actually had clear preferences and upper hand than the Hindus as a common thing and on a routine. This, they wanted to continue ad-infinitum. Secondly, the Hindus themselves never accepted the Muslims as any kind of special people, in spite of them being the rulers. The Hindu orthodoxy find the Muslims '*Mlecchas*', something akin to untouchables. So

whatever the Muslims are, they never got any place at all in the Hindu minds, be it educated Hindu, or illiterate Hindu.

It is interesting here to compare the status of Muslims in Hindu minds as compared to the status of Jews in the Hindu minds. For no obvious particular reasons, the Jews found it much easy to enter the Hindu minds and they enjoyed not only the Hindu love and affection, but also the Hindu trust. The Jews did nothing in particular, perhaps it was the way they conducted in Hindu society, and perhaps it was also the way the Muslims conducted in Hindu society. However, it remained as an irritable fact to the Muslims that they could never get acceptance into the Hindu minds.

Sharar's contribution was his all out efforts to glorifying Islam and filling the Muslim minds with such pride, as it was done by Hitler later, for the Germans. Sharar's self assigned mission was to make the Muslims convinced that they are indeed a great people, above all other 'races' and are destined to rule India, chosen by the God himself. Whatever happens to them happens only for the time being, and in the long run, they are destined to win, and they should not be affected by no matter who says what.

Sharar wrote fictions in historical contexts. He chose the period of the crusades to create a cavalcade of Muslim heroes and heroines who fought such glorious battles to 'protect' their religion in the name of 'Allah' against the crusaders. Some thing like fifty of such inspiring novels, which were nothing short of atom bombs to explode the Muslim minds with pride and hatred to others. Interestingly, we find Hitler also doing the same thing as the Muslim intellectuals in India. On the one hand Hitler tried to fill the German minds with pride through the stories of 'Nordic Aryans', 'Pure Race' 'Creators of Civilisations' and the like. And at the same time, on the other hand, Hitler filled the "Nordic Aryan" minds with hate philosophy and hatred to those who are not Aryans in his 'book', (theories) especially the Jews. Perhaps it may be the case, that for spurious pride to take roots, hatred to other may be a catalyst.

His first novel came out in 1886, followed by many others like 'Islamic Empire in Spain', 'The Arabia of the Days of Ignorance', 'Islam in Arabia', 'Early Days of Islamic Rule in India', 'Muslim India of the Nineteenth Century' and so on. Sharar was not only a novelist; he was also a Journalist even in those days of fiction making. He wrote Historical pieces, Essays, and Literary Criticisms. He wrote on Politics, Education, Reformation, Social Problems and any issue that attracted the Public. He also founded and edited and some times the sole writer also of several magazines. But all these, just with the single intention of making the Muslims anti Hindus. (37)

Sharar was born, brought up, and mostly lived in Lucknow. It was in Lucknow that the court of Oudh and the admirers were striving to re-establish the erstwhile glory of the Mughals, and to re-establish the Muslim glory of the past. Those were the stories that troubled Muslims, their by gone days when they were great rulers of India. How would the Hindus feel of the outsiders and aliens subjugating them to rule over them at the cost of their religion, philosophies and tradition is another question, but the Muslims were feeling much of nostalgia and their intellectuals constantly added fuel to fire.

Through the journal he was editing, 'Muhazzib', (38) he was advocating for Muslim separatism. On 23rd August, 1890, he wrote in his journal: "Times are such that the religious rites of one nation

cannot be performed without injuring the susceptibilities of the other. Nor is there the element of patience to ignore insults. If things have reached such a stage, it would be wise to partition India into Hindu and Muslim provinces and exchange the population. The Hindus seem to be of the view that they should not allow Muslims to be their neighbours. Neither do they like to convey the jingle of their temple bells to the Muslim infidels, nor they themselves like to hear the Azan. Surely, this position would be acceptable to Muslims because they too seem to be tired of Hindus.(39)

Ultimately, we find Sharar also joining the rank of others in Muslim separatism, a point, which, fortunately, doesn't need any evidence to establish. They all had written clearly and had advocated for Muslim separatism, no matter what ever might be the reasons upheld.

Theodore Beck

Theodore Beck was a pro Muslim English man, and Principal of MAO (Muhammadan Anglo Oriental College) at Aligarh, and a very close friend of Sayyid Ahmad Khan. The way he advocated for Muslim separatism is amazing to the point of taking him for a British plant in the 'divide and rule' policy. He called India "a country containing two or more nations tending to oppress the numerically weaker" (40). He explicitly speaks that the Hindu majority is oppressing the Muslim minority, and when it comes from an English man, who is also the Principal, one can imagine how well it can poison the Muslim minds. He says that the Hindus and the Muslims are so different from one another that "not less than the physical difference between the burning plains of Mecca and the snowy heights of the Himalaya is the difference in thought and feeling between the Mahomedan and Hindu worlds" (41). One can find Beck going on glorifying the Muslims and arguing that they are indeed a separate people from the Hindus and thus a separate nation from Indian nation. He says that India can never be one nation. He also says that "The divergence between the Hindus and the Mahomedans is the crucial difficulty in the formation of this nationality, and though the Hindus out number the Mahomedans, the latter showed themselves for six centuries not inferior in physical force" (42)

Strange indeed. Beck is trying to say that the Muslims are equal to the Hindus and just by virtue of Hindus being in the majority, the Muslims are being sidelined. To juxtapose this, Beck produces this interesting argument of Muslims having demonstrated their physical strength for six centuries. Implicitly he says that One Muslim is equal to Four Hindus and hence they are equals, in spite of the Hindus being in majority. He says that the British should never think in terms of India as one nation, because Hindus and Muslims can never be fused together.

Such a possibility of "fusion into a common nationality, seems far distant enough to allow at any rate the present generation of Anglo-Indian statesmen to leave it out of account in their policy". (4).. He justifies the Muslim argument that they are a nation by saying that "if not a nation in the strictest sense of the term, are united by a feeling very like national feeling, and derived from the religious and social bond" (44).

And how strong was his advocacy for the Muslim 'unity' on the basis of religious and social bond! Had he been anywhere near the truth, then that nation which the Muslims carved out from India would have been a united one, but the history shows that they never used to be one. The Muslim unity, was in fact a myth, as it used to be the case with them, and even the thought could only occur with the Hindu presence! Nonetheless, the logic of Beck was running high for Muslim separatism, as they were distinct, and a separate nation. He went on arguing that if the Muslims had to 'suffer' democracy in India, then, "the Hindu party, being in a majority that would fear no change of religion in the voters, would be absolute masters, as no Mahomedan Emperor ever was..." (45). Beck continues "The action of a free parliament in the North – West Provinces would tent, I imagine, to exclude from appointments and extinguish the political influence of the race that where masters here for six centuries, the superb monuments of whose taste now remain as the finest spectacle offered to the visitor of India – a race that still remembers the past, and that counts among its allies not only men in every province in India, but the hardy Afghan beyond he frontier, the Turcoman, and the Arab. (46).

Clearly, Beck could only look at the Indian Muslims and see their perspectives, and certainly not the Hindus. From his description, by India he simply means the India under Muslim rule and the monuments they had erected as palaces, mosques, and tombs. He speaks about the six centuries of Muslim rule in India, but he never thinks in terms of that India of the Vedas, the Upanishads, the numerous knowledge texts, the important six systems in Philosophy, the religion India had produced along with a materialistic metaphysics, and above all, the long civilisation that is tens of thousands of years old, which began with the river 'Saraswati', which dried up from the surface later. If Beck argues in favour of the Muslims, then he must answer this; just also say what the Muslims had done to the Hindus in India? Beck says that the Hindus are hostile to the Muslims, and not the Muslims themselves. He justifies the Muslim position of not joining the Congress by arguing that the Muslims had "no wish to put a rope round their own necks and place themselves at the mercy of those who have hold of the other end". (47)

And these were the kinds of ideas those went to the Muslims from the English man, who also was the principal of the MAO College in Aligarh.

Theodore Morison

Bright, Blunt, Beck and now Morison, there are many English men who up held the Islamic interests. A natural doubt that comes into the minds of any sane man of understanding is that, where they all 'really' championing the cause of the Muslims, or they were simply a part of a larger British plot to thicken the differences among the Muslims and Hindus, so that it becomes easy to dominate and rule the people of India? In 1885, we know that the Indian National Congress was formed by an English man, Allan Octavian Hume. Hume was a civil servant for a long time, and suddenly we see him with the formation of the Congress. Common sense logic is sufficient to suspect him being planted by the British administration and then made the Muslims suspect the

congress through people like Sayyid Ahmad Khan. All these could very well fit into a greater plot of state craft, for prolonging the colonial rule in India.

Morison too came to India as the principal of the MAO College, Aligarh. A very great friend of Sayyid Ahmad, he was more than Sayyid Ahmad to the Muslims on many fronts. Morison became the member of the Council of the Secretary of the State for India. Morison had supported the Aligarh movement and Muslim separatism. He argued for separate electorate for the Muslims, he stood for separate minority status for the Muslims, and finally, he was instrumental in making the Muhammadan Anglo Oriental College into the Aligarh Muslim University, a university itself for the Muslims, to 'protect' their interests of separatism. His book, 'The Imperial Rule in India' was published in 1899, and was completed much before he came to Aligarh. The significance of this lies in the fact that he had come to Aligarh already with these ideas of Muslim separatism, and Islamic fundamentalism and separatism were nothing new to his mind. One can see that Morison had come to India with definite plans and programmes, and whatever he had written and spoken are no accident by any means. Let us see his own words:

"The Muhammadans are in some ways the most definite and homogenous political unit in India; they are heirs of a common civilisations and common traditions of glory, and hey are conscious to an extent unsurpassed in India of their corporate existence. If the 57 million Muhammadans of India were all collected in one province or tract of country, if for instance, the North of India from Peshawar to Agra were inhabited exclusively by the Muhammadans, a national spirit associated with those territorial limits would already be in process of formation, which would suggest a practical solution of the present problem. But the Muhammadans are, as a matter of fact, scattered in isolated groups all over the peninsula, and in consequence such sentiment of nationality as the do possess links them not with Sikhs and Bengalis, with whom they share the soil, but with their co-religionists wherever they are found, be it in Arabia or Persia or within the frontiers of India. So little the Muhammadan regard India as their own country that their great poet, Hali, has compared his people to guests who have overstayed their welcome, and lamented that they ever left their native homes for India. The views held by the Muhammadans (certainly the most aggressive and turbulent of the people of India) are alone sufficient to prevent the establishment of an independent Indian Government. Where the Afghan to descend from the north upon an autonomous India, the Muhammadans, instead of uniting with the Sikhs and Hindus to repel him, would be drawn by all the ties of kinship and religion to join his flag". (48)

This perhaps could be the best example for 'Utopian' Ideas. The belief the religion could unite the Muslims is rather very optimistic of them. The argument of the intellectuals take a course that the Muslims are a nation distinct from India, since what unites them is the religion of Islam, and the religion itself is their culture. Thus, any Muslim any where could be brought together with any Muslim from any where and they shall live in peace and happiness. But this hope is far flung. Just take the case of Pakistan itself, the land the Muslims obtained from India with the British help to live in peace! The moment they found Pakistan, (meaning pure land) the very hate philosophy and epistemology of difference with which they carved out a Pakistan began to work as it is the normal case, and the Muslims started finding further differences among themselves. Now the question of religion is settled, no non Muslim to hate, and they started finding differences among the Muslims themselves, of sects, language, region, and tribe, there by proving that religion had not been any

cementing factor for the Muslims. The Muslims started killing among themselves through all kinds of separatism. The Englishmen who supported the Muslims for their separatist philosophy are indeed responsible also for abetting terrorism in contemporary terms. The English men glorified the 'aggressiveness' of the Muslims, but it is the same aggressiveness and arrogance that turns into brutality of anti humanism and terrorism.

It is true that the Indian Muslims could speak of their past glory. But what they do not realise is that, these glory is not from the fact that they were Muslims, but it was from the fact that they were Indians. Irrespective of what had been ones religion, the culture of the land of India had united all Indians through a cultural unity of philosophy and tradition, and with an epistemology of oneness. Contemporary researches, both in archaeology and history show us that the Saraswati valley civilisation, which was spread over 88,000 square kilometres with 3,7,00 settlements shared the same civilisation, culture and religion with no force or power uniting them. What made the Muslim rule in India significant is the Indian culture and tradition, no matter what their faith system had been. It was wrong for any one to associate Islam with the so called glory, and had it been the case, why they could not repeat the same thing else where?

This again is some thing like the spurious 'Aryan Theory'. The theory says that Aryan is a race and they came to India and created Indian civilisation, a theory in which poor Hitler was drunk. If Aryan is a race (Aryan is not a race, it is only an honorific term in Sanskrit language), then why the same people could not make similar civilisations elsewhere also? Why only in India? Similarly, why the Muslim glory only in India? And why the same thing could not happen any more once the same people became a Pakistan? Why both Afghanistan and Pakistan and many such Muslim nations are going back in time to the days of barbarianism?

I think that the Muslims have lost their so called glory the moment they started detaching from India. Perhaps their most glorious period was their stay in India, though for the Hindus it was otherwise. They had freedom, there were no Mawlawis dictating terms and conditions to the Muslims restricting their day to day life and freedom, and the government would have been just. In spite of all the Muslim hatred and separatism, in India, there are more Muslims living comfortably than in Pakistan. Finally, the intellectuals were slowly moving towards Jihadi terrorism, slowly, but steadily.

References

1. Select speeches of Right Hon. John Bright on Public Questions, London, 1907, p.14. *Speech on legislation and policy in India*, delivered in the House of Commons on the second reading of the Indian bill, 24, June, 1858, Edward Stanford, London, 1858.
2. Ibid, page 13.
3. *Select Speeches of Rt. Hon. John Bright on Public questions*, London, 1907, p.51
4. KK Aziz, 'A history of the Idea of Pakistan', Vanguard, Lahore, 1987, page- 9
5. Althaf Husain Hali, *Hayat- I – Javed*, Lahore, n.d, p.263
6. Quoted in Choudhry Khaliquzzaman, *Pathway to Pakistan*, Lahore, 1961, pp. 269 – 270
7. *Sir Sayyid Ahmad on the present state of Indian Politics, consisting of speeches and letters reprinted from the "Pioneer"*, Allahabad, 1888, pp. 2 – 24
8. Ibid., pp. 25 – 28
9. *Sir Sayyid Ahmad on the Present state* pp.30 – 53
10. Ibid, pp. 63 – 71
11. Shamloo (comp), *Speeches and Statements of Iqbal*, Lahore, 1948 ed, pp. 130 – 132
12. S Hyder, *Progress of Pakistan*, Lahore, June 1947, p 23, Parveen Feroze Hasan, *The Political Philosophy of Iqbal*, Lahore, n.d., p. 214, Mirza Abid, *Jamaluddin Afghani*, Lahore, 4th ed 1966, pp. 12, 14, 16, 19.
13. S Hyder, *Progress of Pakistan*, Lahore, June 1947, p 23, Parveen Feroze Hasan, *The Political Philosophy of Iqbal*, Lahore, n.d., p. 214, Mirza Abid, *Jamaluddin Afghani*, Lahore, 4th ed 1966, pp. 12, 14, 16, 19
14. EG Browne, *The Persian Revolution*, London, 1966, ed, p.5, Nikki R Keddie, "Sayyid Jamal – al- din al – Afghani's First Twenty – Seven Years: The Darkest Period", *Middle East Journal*, winter, 1966, pp. 526 – 527
15. *Proceedings of the Government of India in the Foreign Department, Political (Calcutta)*, 1869, "Cabul Diaries", Nikki R Keddie, op.cit., *Middle eastern studies*, July, 1965, p.336
16. A.S Lethbridge, general Superintendent, Thagi and Dakaiti Department, Government of India, memorandum, *copy printed by the F.O., London, No. 55, dated 1896, Public Records Office*, London, F.O. 60/594
17. Afshar and Mahdavi, op.cit., pp.12, 157
18. Sharif al – Mujahid, op.cit., pp. 104 – 105]
19. Bipen Chandra Pal, 'Nationality and Empire', Calcutta, 1916, pp. 370 – 371
20. Bipen Chandra Pal, 'Memories of my life and time', Calcutta, 1932, p. 417
21. Aziz Ahmad, op. cit., *journal of the American Oriental Society*, July – September 1969, p.476
22. 'Haqiqat-i-Mazhab-i-Necheri' published twice in Persian and once in Urdu translation in 1883 – 4
23. The original Persian title of this article was 'Sharah-i-Hal-i-Aghurian', appeared in the 'Muallam-i-Shafiq' of September and October 1881 in two instalments. He calls Sayyid Ahmad Khan as 'Nasatuda-i-Marg Khan' meaning as 'one rejected or unglorified even by death!'
24. See SM Ikram, 'Yadgar-i-Shibli' Lahore, 1971, pp. 384 – 385. Persian original as well as the Urdu translation, both are there
25. Jacob M Landau, 'Al-Afghani's Pan Islamic Project', *Islamic Culture*, July, 1952, p.51
26. Letter dated 12 December 1895, public Records Office, F.O. 60/594, Quoted in Nikki R Keddie, op. cit., *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, April 1962, p. 282
27. Ibid.
28. Nikki R Keddie, op.cit., 'Comparative Studies in Society and History', April, 1962, p.283. British foreign Office Sources
29. CC Adams, 'Islam and Modernism in Egypt', London, 1933, p.12
30. *Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Eds Gibb and Kramer, Leiden, 1953, pp. 85 – 86

31. WS Blunt, '*Ideas about India*' London, 1885, p. 89
32. *Ibid*, p. 163
33. WS Blunt, '*India Under Ripon: A Private Diary*', London, 1909, pp. 107 – 108.
34. Ian Stephens, '*Pakistan*' London, 1963, p. 70
35. The '*Rafique-i-Hind*', founded, owned edited and published by Muharram Ali Chisti. First published on 5. January, 1884 as a weekly. It ceased publication in 1904. Source, Imdad Sabiri, '*Tarikh-i-Sahafat-i-Urdu*', Vol III, Delhi, n.d., AS Khurshid, '*Sahafat Pakistan wa Hind men*', Lahore, 1963, pp. 280 – 281
36. Rep in Pakistan Caliphate, '*The Genesis of Pakistan*', CMG, 6 Aug, 1942
37. Ram Babu Saxena, '*A History of Urdu Literature*', Allahabad, 1927, Second Edition, 1940, pp. 334 – 341, Muhammad Sadiq, '*A History of Urdu Literature*', London, 1964, pp. 339 – 344
38. First issue came out on 1st August, 1890
39. Quoted in AS Khurshid, '*Origin of Pakistan: Tendencies that Led to partition*', TPT, 23. March, 1962
40. Theodore Beck, *article in 'The Pioneer'*, 2 and 3 November, 1887
41. Theodore beck, '*Essays on Indian Topics: Reprinted from The Pioneer and Other Papers*', Allahabad, 1888, p. 45
42. *Ibid*, p. 46
43. *Ibid*, p. 47
44. *Ibid*, p. 48
45. *Ibid*, pp. 82 – 83
46. *Ibid*, pp. 83 – 84
47. *Ibid*, p.84
48. Theodore Morison, '*Imperial Rule in India: Being an Examination of the Principles Proper to the Government of Dependencies*', London, 1899, pp. 4 – 5

Chapter -3-

Evolution of Separatism into Ninteenth Century

The beginning of nineteenth century: and by then, the Hindu Muslim gulf had been sufficiently widened to an extent of no return. The Muslim minds were greatly filled with the hate Philosophy and the epistemology of difference, and then the repercussions from the Hindu side, a people, who are immensely proud of their heritage and history. From the Hindu perspective, the Muslims have no rights whatsoever to demand anything at all. Muslims came to India as invaders, for a long time they came in different groups only to take away the wealth but another lot came eventually who settled and ruled. They brought their religion and different practices, and a culture of their own. But through the centuries, they were getting amalgamated into the Indian ways, and the differences could have been slowly melted away, had the intellectuals did not involve in hate philosophy of differences. Perhaps India could have produced a different brand of Muslims who could have cemented the present day con-feeling the world might have towards the Muslims in general, through their programme of terrorism and devastation, and also of killing innocent many. And now, it all had become an open question, with no solution in sight. The basic problem remains, how to react to a people, who think that they can not live with any one else, all others are necessarily oppressors to them, and who are different from others on account of their religion? There is no communication channel leading to them, and they keep closed minds of obsolescence.

The first ten years in 19th century saw much movements and developments. The province of Bengal was divided as Hindu Bengal and Muslim Bengal, which the Muslims rejoiced and the Hindus objected to; the Muslims went with a deputation for separate electorates, the Muslims formed their own political party from the newly found Muslim Bengal the very next year of the division, the Minto Morley reforms gave the Muslims what they demanded and so on and so forth.

Some of the British rulers thought it wise to support the Muslims, to prolong the colonial rule in India. They had already hit upon the divide and rule policy, a policy they saw and learned from India, when they experienced the Muslim leaders approaching them with the ideas that the Muslims are a nation separate. They found it convenient to them to widen the gap and make the Hindus and Muslims fight. They also thought of creating differences among the Hindus themselves, in the name of castes and languages, which did not work out very well on a final analysis. But the British could never foresee that they were actually making the remote control of Islamic Bombs that went off in London much later, and Jihadi Terrorism.

In June 1907, Lord Percy said in the House of Commons: "India is not a homogenous nationality but a congeries of races animated by antagonistic ideals. Muslims are physically superior but numerically inferior and the Hindus physically inferior but numerically far superior. Therefore, government by majorities in India must mean the government of the strong by the weak".(1). CF Andrews writes to the private secretary to the Viceroy in 1908: "There is a rapid Hinduising of national ideas going on among the younger men and a Hindu religious colouring is given to National ideas."(2).

In 1909, Andrews wrote an article saying: "Today it is probably in many Hindu minds, one of the strongest emotional force evoking love of the country Today many of the noblest among the younger Hindus are finding in a revival of their sentiment a partial satisfaction of their rising national instincts. They don't strictly distinguish in their thoughts – perhaps they hardly wish to

distinguish – between mother India as the object of their devotion and that motherland within the Divine Nature itself of which Hindu saints and philosophers have spoken, and which had become embodied in popular legend as a religion of the common people No Mussalman could join with a Hindu on this religious basis, however patriotic he might be, however he might love India, as his own native country. This fact should be clearly recognised by those who wish Indian patriotism to be all-embracing and inclusive, and not merely confined to Hinduism”(3).

This was a natural outcome though we can clearly see the exaggeration of Andrews. What is come to be called as the Hindu religion is an assemblage of everything Indian, the Philosophy and the entire Vedic wisdom. It is not merely rituals and practices like the other ones. Let us put it this way, it is an Omni Vehicle, that carries everything that is Indian. One must distinguish that rituals and rites, sometimes even contradicting one another co exist within the broad frame of the Hindu *Dharma*, and there is no contradiction, conflict, since the very epistemology here is one that of oneness, or togetherness. At the same time, it becomes a huge mistake to use any Semitic category of religion in Indian context and the Hindu context; which could simply become reductionism, and a category mistake. In the Indian tradition, love for motherland, devotion to nature and the metaphysics of the Upanishads, all are interlinked. It is indeed difficult for a Hindu to separate his *Dharma* from his love of nature as well as love of Nation or love for neighbour. So the accusation that Hindus are mixing nationalism with religion is unfounded, if by religion it is meant *Dharma*. At the same time, Hindus do not have a concept of religion in the Semitic sense at all, to prove what had been pushed by the above quote. And, to be precise, what is not divine to a Hindu? Everything carries the unmistakable mark of divinity to him, or there is divinity within everything, or everything is divine itself. And, Nationalism, is naturally, one that of *Dharma*.

Further, why blaming the Hindu youths even if what had been stated is correct? Who had been telling around that Muslims are a nation and they are different from the Hindus? Who had been spreading the hate philosophy and epistemology of difference? The moment the Muslim intellectuals keep saying that Muslims are a 'nation', how funny it becomes to the Indian minds? It all becomes difficult for the Hindu to understand, his categories of concepts are differently patterned to love the entire world and all living beings, flora, and fauna alike.

It is indeed unfortunate that many British officers made considerable efforts to give impressions to the authority in England that the Hindu Muslim gulf is so natural and can not be bridged. They also in their un understanding looked at India not as one nation. They thought that religion is the only binding force for civilisations, and that can keep societies together. But then, all these had been utterly proved wrong. Bengal Muslims found it impossible to live with Muslims of Sindh and other places, and the same thing repeated in Pakistan among different Muslims. Different sects within Islam found it difficult to live together. And this goes on and on, and once they find some free time from fighting one another, they start blaming the others for everything and start planting bombs all over, which is the terrorism of today. Any way, this mixing up of *Dharma* with the love for motherland is natural to Hindus, and perhaps the Muslim attitude must have given it a different turn of solidarity among the Hindus, which is to be expected as a natural course, and in fact it had happened much later than that could have happened if it had not been the Hindus.

But then the Muslims wanted to solve all their 'problems' through the sharpness of the cutting edge of a knife, by dividing India in the religious line, as Hindu India and Muslim India. How optimistic they were that it is going to 'solve' all their problems! How optimistic they were that the Muslims are going to live in harmony and peace once they 'escape' from the 'clutches' of their wretched 'brothers', the Hindus! There was just one thing only that mattered, religion, and that was the only thing in their minds. Were they all so poor intellectuals, who lacked complete intelligence? But, they remained confident.

The first ten years of nineteenth century saw Muslim separatism making high head way in this direction. In 1905, Bengal was divided into Hindu Bengal and Muslim Bengal, a separate province of the Muslims was founded, on 1st October 1906, the Muslims demanded separate and extra representation in all elected bodies, which they realised through the Minto Morley reforms of 1909. In December 1906, they founded a new Muslim party from Dhaka, the All India Muslim League, an exclusive Muslim Party for a Muslim India. They thought that they were to be liberated from the 'clutches' of the Hindus and they are going to live in peace and harmony with their ultimate aim of forming a Muslim nation apart from India. Many of their intellectuals expressed confidence in peace and harmony when the Muslims are 'freed' from Hindu 'clutches'.

On 15th and 16th of 1907, Maulana Muhammad Ali gave two lectures at Allahabad in this connection. He was touching upon the topics of 'The Present Political Situation' and 'The Muhammadan Programme'. Just see how he puts things: "The Muslim League was not an effort at disintegration but at integration" and he says that Muslim League which is a party for Muslim Nationalism and Indian National Congress, which is a party for Hindu Nationalism are going to co exist like two trees growing on either sides of the road: "Their trunks stood apart, but their roots were fixed in the same soil, drawing nourishment from the same source. The branches were bound to meet when the stems had reached their full stature, and shade the passer-by. The soil was British, the nutriment was common patriotism, the trunks were the two political bodies, and the road was the highway of peaceful progress"(4). Akbar Allahabadi, a famous Urdu poet makes an explicit and interesting demand to "solve" the Hindu Muslim 'problem'. In 1905, he said that the area to the north of the river Yamuna must be given to the Muslims as a separate Muslim nation. The south of river Yamuna should be given to all others, the Hindus, Sikhs, Buddhists, Jains, Christians, Jews, and Parsis. Once this is done, then all will live in peace and harmony. The exact Urdu words I quote: "*Jumuna dariya tak agar ūpper ka hissa Musalmanōn ko de diya jāye, to dōnoñ Qāmēñ itminān ki zindagi basar kar sakti hai*"(5).

Muhammad Ali

Muhammad Ali was the founder and editor of an English journal, 'comrade'. As the name suggests, there was definite influence of communism in his writings, and the journal itself. Apparently this may be strange, a nexus between communism and Islam, but on a closer and meticulous analysis, it reveals that the nexus is natural in certain situations, where the relationship becomes utility oriented, socially and politically. In reality, there is an epistemological connection

between Islam and communism, since they both work on and work with the theories of differences. This epistemological connection can make them function hand in hand, so long as they have a common goal or desideratum. In our context, they both did not want a Hindu India. The Muslims did not want a Hindu India for reasons well spelt out before, but the communists also did not want a Hindu India for reasons entirely different from those of the Muslims.

The entire theories of the communists are based on an epistemology of differences. They perceive differences, maintain differences, and also create differences. They treat their concepts of differences so sharply and hard, that it becomes a relation of 'antagonism', from which the communists spin out their theories of 'contradictions', 'conflicts', and class wars. Marx had twisted the philosophy (method actually) of dialectics of Hegel to make it materialistic and created his theory based on social as well as historical contradictions. But then, any theory founded on an epistemology of differences can not stand in India, where there is an already established epistemology which is diagonally opposite of the epistemology of differences. Thus, the very structure of communism is such that, Indian epistemology is anti-matter to that. Indian epistemology, which underlies in almost everything Indian, instantly neutralises the tall claims and emotional stories of the communists, and they could not take roots in India at all, in spite of their long presence here. Then the communists commits the second mistake; they think that it is because of the Hindu religion that they are unable to make penetrations into Indian society, and started doing reductionisms as usual in their attempts to understanding both India and the Hindu *Dharma*.

This puts the communists and the Muslims together in their fight against the Hindu *Dharma*, which goes on till date. Thus, for all practical purposes, it is nothing unusual when the Muslims form an affiliation with the communists, implicitly or explicitly, when it is the Indian context. Subsequently, in later days, the Muslims had often found communism and the theories of not only Marx and others, but also of the modernists as well as the post-modernists a medium of expression as well as an escape route. Perhaps, it may be this Muhammad Ali, who had put this to use, through his journal, 'Comrade' for the first time at all; who knows?

On 14th January 1911, he wrote in his 'comrade': "We have no faith in the cry that India is united. The problems of India are almost international. But when the statesmen and philanthropists of Europe, with all its wars of interests and jealousies, do not despair of abolishing war and placing Pax on the throne of Bellona, shall we despair of Indian nationality? We may not create today the patriotic fervour and fine national frenzy of Japan with its forty millions of homogenous people. But a concordat like that of Canada is not beyond the bounds of practicability. It may not be a love-marriage born of romance and poetry. But a 'marriage de convenance' honourably contracted and honourably maintained, is not to be despised"(6). As it still is the case with the communists, Ali too was seeing 'international' aspects in Indian problems. It indeed is a phenomenon with the communists to speak of internationally of most things, especially when they have nothing else to say.

Their theories are such. In principle at least, they stand for international working class, albeit it remains a sad case that the class theory is a big mistake and any attempt to bring societies under

the category of class is reductionism. But then, the communists are fetishised with the idea of international and internationalism. And interestingly, Hitler calls the communists as 'international lepers' in his Mein Kampf, from these obsessions of theirs! I do not know which of Hitler's feelings are original, whether his hatred towards the Jews, or his utter despise to the communists, but often times he treats these two things as one and the same as well as mutually inter changeable. Hitler and his thoughts!! Muhammad Ali says further :

"..... the problems of India are not so national as international. And in international law, the strength of a country or power does not count, for the basic principle of that law is equality of all nations. The Mussalman stand on a par with the smaller power of Europe, and can even claim like that powers an absolute equality in all inter-communal controversies. But they do not do so, and limit their demand to such a representation as is adequate and effective for the preservation of their existence and their honour" (7).

It is difficult for the communists to conceive of a 'united' India. Their epistemology does not permit them so. They find, draw and maintain differences, and Ali too could not see a united India in his perception. "... a united India does not exist today. We have to create it, and the first necessary condition before it can be created is to recognise that it does not exist." (8)

'Comrade' was the first English Muslim journal, and was undoubtedly influenced by communist theories. The language used was provocative and bullying, as it had always been the case with the communists. But Ali himself had shifted political parties from time to time, without ever escaping from the influences of communism. He had supported separate electorate, supported the division of Bengal on Hindu Muslim lines, and stood by the theory that India is not one nation. He had also thought of and spread the ideas of a separate Muslim nation, perfectly in line with the ancient concept of Dar-ul-Islam.

The first decade of the nineteenth century saw the Muslim intellectuals making all out efforts with their hate philosophy and ideas of separatisms, which were bearing fruits slowly. The Hindus mostly remained hopeful of the possibility of Hindu Muslim unity, and the ideas of 'Muslims as a nation' remained a strange one in their minds. But slowly, they were to face the reality of Muslim separatism getting stronger day by day, and the second and third decades of the nineteenth century became harder for any one who had been thinking on the lines of togetherness and co existence. In the presidential address to the Indian National Congress in 1911, Bishan Narayan Dhar spells out this clearly. "The idea of a united Indian nation may not be alluring to some people, and a section of the Muhammadans may, for the present, fail to realise its true significance; but the instructed class do care for that ideal and they see that it is menaced by separatism" (9).

True enough, some sections of the Muslims wanted to be separate without understanding its full implications, and some sections of the Muslims did become separate from India and formed a Pakistan. There upon nothing became different to them except the tortures of partition, and the newly founded nation through separatism found many more reasons to find differences among themselves to quarrel on and on with one another, which had made their newly founded nation torn into pieces from internal differences. If this is what they had got from all their struggles, I do not think that any sane Muslim would have wanted this.

The Muslim fear of a Hindu rule where the Muslims shall be necessarily minority had already become a reality with not just Indian Muslims, but with some of the English men also. At the same time, some among the Hindus also feared the Pan Islamic movement, of consolidating Muslims from India, Afghanistan, Turkey, Egypt and so on, and if this was to happen, then the Hindus shall simply be doomed. The Hindus knew very well about what had happened to the civilisations of Iran, Afghanistan, and Egypt etc. through Islamic invasion, apart from the raw experiences in India. Nonetheless, there were many among the Hindus who sincerely hoped and aspired for a Hindu Muslim unity. When Sarojini Naidu told Gopal Krishna Gokhale that Hindu Muslim Unity could be achieved in five year' time, what Gokhale told her is significant: "Child, you are a poet, but you hope too much. It will not come in your life time or mine. But keep your faith and work for it if you can" (10).

Bipen Chandra Pal says: "Pan-Islamism and Pan-Mongolianism offer, therefore, the greatest menace to India's future and to the realisation of the dream of the India Nationalist And the real strength of this Pan-Islamic outburst will come from Egypt and India Indian nationalism, in any case, has, I think, no fear of being permanently opposed or crippled by Great Britain. The sixty millions of Mahomedans in India, if inspired by Pan-Islamic aspirations, joined to the Islamic principalities and powers that stand both to our west and our north west may easily put an end to all our nationalist aspirations, almost at any moment, if the present British connection be severed..... Indeed, the backbone of Pan-Islamism is not in Persia or Afghanistan, much less in Algeria or Abyssinia, but in India and Egypt. This sentiment is the strongest among the Egyptian and Indian Muslims (11). At the same time, apart from the Muslims, some British also supported the Muslim fear of a Hindu rule of domination as usual. The Lieutenant Governor of the united Provinces, Sir James Meston wrote to the Viceroy of the Muslim fear saying that given a chance, the Muslims "know that, if they lost us, the Hindus would eat them up" (12).

Lord Curzon writes to the British Cabinet on 2nd June, 1917 about the question of self-government to India this way: "what do we mean by self-government for Indians? We do not mean that India, either now or in any future that can be reasonably predicted, will become a single autonomous unit Such an aspiration, in the present phase of Indian evolution, is the wildest of dreams; and the belief that it can be attained is doomed to irretrievable disappointment. Neither do we mean that India can be resolved into an organised federation of autonomous states under the control of a federal government of Delhi or elsewhere. That also is an impracticable ideal It may be that in the march towards the self-governing ideal the political unity of India may be disintegrated and assume different shapes" (13). And the Muslims remained persistent that they are a nation separate, they have a political existence apart from 'others', all because they belong to the religion of Islam. Let us look at how a scholar sums up the situation: "The most striking fact in this account is the Muslim's assertion, at every point, of their community's right to a separate political existence. The strategies of politics, as we have seen, were not constant; the type of Muslim politician with influence varied; and the political system underwent radical change. But this determination to maintain a distinct political identity was through out the basic factor in Muslim thinking. The suggestion that the community should take its place simply as one religious and cultural group in a diverse Indian nation was never entertained" (14).

This sums up the Muslim problem, that time for India, but then, it is precisely this attitude of the Muslims that went into the making of modern terrorism and all Islamic problems in the entire world. Just imagine, in India, which is a nation with all kinds of religious and cultural groups living together, why no one else is having this problem of a so called separate 'nationalism'? And, if all others except the Hindus start feeling the same as the Muslims, then what would be India, or for that matter any nation where multi religious groups live? None of these sane questions make any sense to 'our brothers', and the Muslim intellectuals kept pressing the common Muslims to organise for a separate political existence with the pride of their so called physical superiority which gets mentioned by the Muslim intellectuals as well as their British supporters from time to time. Obviously, they both had been very silent upon any reference to an intellectual superiority! This explicit reference to physical superiority with obvious silence upon intellectual abilities is nothing but a tributary to erstwhile barbaric ways, where might had been the right.

Wilayet Ali "Bambooque"

Wilayet Ali was a product of the MAO college of Aligarh, and was a practicing lawyer at Barabanki. He was one of the close associate of Muhammad Ali and the journal, 'Comrade'. He continued as a columnist in the comrade under the name "Bambooque", and the columns was entitled 'Gup' to mean either gossip, or this and that, etc. he used satire to drive the Hindu Muslim separatism into the Muslim minds, a technique, which was not so popular those days. The column 'Gup' contained some very interesting materials. One of such items in the 'Gup' was an interview with a person, who does not give much to thoughts but is straight forward otherwise. This was published on 10th May, 1913. The interview runs along as questions and answers:

"Question: 'How would you solve the Hindu Muhammadan problem?'

Answer: 'The Hindus and Muhammadans should be segregated – northern India should be assigned to the Moslems and the rest to the Hindus'

Then the interviewer points out that there are many others in India apart from Hindus and Muslims. There are Christians, Jews, Buddhists, Jains, Sikhs and the like. The immediate response of that gentleman went this way: 'The Sikhs and Jains and other castes and creeds will go with the Hindus' " (15).

Even in the form of humour, the Muslim separatism was powerful. The suggestion that entire north of India to go to the Muslims and the rest to all others had been the Muslim aspiration, but the impracticability of the same made them to present it at least in the humour form. Look at how casually it is said that all others will have to go with the Hindus, which is very suggestive of the Muslim attitude. They are not bothered of any one else except themselves, and they are too bothered about themselves to an extent that they are definitely separate from all others, so that they can not live with any one else. And eventually, it is this very hate philosophy and separatist epistemology that made the Muslims really distinct, from all others, and they now suffer alienation

especially after taking to arms through their faith in physical vigour and 'courage' all of which, ultimately culminates in terrorism.

Indeed the Muslims wished for an Islamic Empire to take shape. Their only criterion was Islam and nothing else. They were too short sighted to foresee the manifold differences among themselves which were to begin, to destroy civilisations under Islamic control. But for that time, this used to be a beautiful dream for them. One Lovat Fraser, who used to edit 'The Times of India', had drawn a map of a Muslim corridor, where the Muslims are in majority, which could become the area within the projected Islamic Empire. The corridor begins from Constantinople, runs through all areas in between till Saharanpur, which is in the present Uttar Pradesh of India. Muhammad Ali, had mentioned the same corridor with much enthusiasm many a times to impress upon the seriousness of Islamic identity and separatism (16).

Chaudhary Rahmat Ali is yet another personality of Muslim separatism. Though among the separatist intellectuals his turn is coming by the year of 1933, he had made a claim in his book that the idea of Muslim separate state occurred to him in 1915, right from the time he was a student. The influences of Sayyid Ahmad and others were definite in the young Muslim minds, and as an undergraduate student at the Islamia College, Lahore, he founded a society in the College under the name 'Bazm-i-shibli' for the Muslim cause of separatism. In its inaugural address he spoke: "North of India is Muslim and we will keep it Muslim. Not only that. We will make it a Muslim state. But this we can do only if and only if when we and our north cease to be Indian. For that is a prerequisite to it. So the sooner we shed 'Indianism', the better for us and Islam." (17)

The Kheiri Brothers

The two brothers, Abdul Jabbar Kheiri and Abdul Sattar Kheiri played significant roles towards Muslim separatism. They were basically Arabs, whose ancestors arrived in India at the time of Shahjahan as Arabic teachers for the Mughal princes. One Khairullah was one among the first who arrived, but no much details about him is available. But an unbroken line of the present Kheiris could be traced to one Abdul Khaliq, whose son was one Abdul Qadir. Abdul Qadir had two sons, Abdul Wajid and Abdul Hamid. Abdul Hamid's son, Rashid-ul-Kheiri was a Urdu writer. Abdul Hamid had three sons, Abdul Jabbar, Abdul Ghaffar and Abdul Sattar. The middle brother, Abdul Ghaffar got employed in the irrigation department, but beat up his English boss and blissfully lost his job, and remained unemployed ever since. He migrated from India to Pakistan in 1947.

During 1908 – 11, the three Kheiris left India. One of them had a miserable married life, who wanted to escape frustration, and the other two accompanied, and they went to Beirut. They stayed there few years, and during that stay, they organised a Muslim Boy Scout movement called 'Khashshaf', meaning 'explorers'. They established a Madrasa-i-Hindia to educate Muslim boys. They were actively involved in promoting the separatist theories among the Muslim youths, but some thing unknown must have happened, Abdul Ghaffar had to return from Beirut to India, and

the other two Kheiris went to Istanbul. At Istanbul, initially they were involved in the Turkish war against the Allies, and then they got involved in the Khilafat movement. Their support to the Khalifat invited anger from Mustafa Kamal, who called them as 'the two mad Indians'. With Ataturk, they had to run, and they ran to Germany somewhere in the twenties. They lived in Germany for nearly or more than ten years, where they established an 'Islamic Society'. To be in the mainstream, they joined the national Socialist Party, and were much influenced by fascist ideas. And then before Hitler, they left Germany. Abdul Jabbar wanted to come back to India, but the British government did not allow him to enter India. He went to England and joined the Labour Party, and kept trying to come back to India. Finally he could reach India, and settled in Delhi. He tried to organise a Para military movement with the Aligarh students, which did not succeed much. His dreams of Muslim separatism could not come the way he desired, or could not make him the top man; He was nothing to the newly founded Pakistan, and he remained in Delhi even after 1947, and died as a bachelor in early fifties.

Abdul Sattar, returned to India from Germany in early thirties, and went to live in Aligarh. He was married to a German lady while in Germany, who also accompanied him to India. Abdul Sattar taught German and French at Aligarh Muslim University and could involve with the movements there. He had two daughters and one son, and when he died in 1945; his wife went back to Germany and the children to Pakistan.

While at Aligarh, Abdul Sattar had organised some students and established a branch of Muslim League Party (18). He was closely watched by the secret police ever since his return from Germany, and when the Second World War broke out, the government put him in Dehra Dun Jail for about two years. From the jail he kept writing to the Muslim League party and Jinnah, and so much so, the Muslim League Party in their Council meeting at Delhi in September 1940 had requested the government to free him and lamented his detention without trial as a B class prisoner (19).

There was a conference of the 'Socialist International' in 1917 at Stockholm. (The Bolshevik revolution of Lenin must have inspired this). The Indian delegation consisted of four students, Virendranath Chattopadhyaya, M.Acharya, Abdul Jabbar Kheiri and Abdul Sattar Kheiri. How on earth the Kheiris became interested in Socialism and communism became soon proved, through a written statement submitted by them to the conference to partition India into Hindu India and Muslim India. A summary of this statement was published in the official proceedings of the conference which were edited by Camille Huysmans of Belgium and issued in French from Uppsala towards the beginning of 1918.

Later, in May 1938, Abdul Sattar writes to Jinnah from Aligarh: "We here in Aligarh have the fullest faith in you. We feel that the interests of not only 90,000,000 Indian Muslims are secure in your hands but also those of the generations to come. BUT it is rather disquieting to hear that pressure is being brought on you to bring about an understanding at any cost, provided some selfish members may be able to get a few big jobs The most fundamental fact and the right that the 90,000,000 of Indian Muslims are in THEMSELVES A GREAT NATION and A SEPARATE POLITICAL ENTITY must not be sacrificed" (20). Two months later he circulated letters to all the members of the Muslim council of the two nation concept, officially as the president of the Muslim

League party of the Muslim University. Six months later, at Patna session of the League in December, he went around distributing leaflets to this very same effect (21).

We do not have much clear and concrete records of the Kheiris. Though they organised Muslim youths under various names where ever they went about, though they kept meeting these groups on a continuous manner, none of their meetings were much public, and none of them were recorded. What are all the kinds of ideas and words put into the minds of Muslim youths at various places, we do not know. But one thing is clear, they had definite access to the minds of the youths under their control, and they definitely put separatist ideas through hate philosophies and epistemology of differences. But they did take much strain and struggled to go from one place to another, from Turkey, Egypt and to Europe. Even when one of them is married in Europe, they continued in their path continuously, and unerringly. I would say that here is a family, who spent their entire life for just Muslim separatism and terrorism.....

Aga Khan

Persian in origin, Aga Khan was an important personality among the Indian Muslims. To make the Muhammadan Anglo Oriental College (MAO College) of Aligarh into an Aligarh Muslim University, he played an important role. He played very significant part in wining separate electorates for the Muslims. He was constantly working for the Muslim interests right from the 1906 Simla deputation to the working of 1935 reforms and he tried his best to protect and sustain the Muslim interests from the British.

But with all these, the real Aga Khan and his secret intentions never came into the lime light. He worked out a strategy of not going anti Hindus openly and not condemning the Congress Publicly. This way, he obtained the supports from the Hindu intellectuals, who were starving to get as many Muslims as possible into the national mainstream. Being with the Hindus, Being with the Congress, he contemplated ways and means to protect the Muslim interests with the ulterior motive of establishing a Muslim Empire.

This hope had its limits, and indeed the limit itself. Hundred of years the Muslims had ruled India, the Muslims had great Empires and Emperors, they occupied many fortresses from the Hindus and reshaped as well as reconstructed them in the Muslim patterns and obtained the name as great builders from historians, and yet, they failed in their principal duty, of making majority of Hindus into Muslims. This has happened only in India, otherwise, where ever the Muslims ruled, they converted the masses into Islam, leaving the places Muslim majority. Muhammad bin Qasim had turned Afghanistan and Sindh into Muslim provinces through the Arab invasion of Sindh centuries ago. In all other places where the Muslims went and stayed, they left a Muslim majority behind depending on the period of their stay. But in India, this had not happened. With all the so called glories of the Muslim rule, the Hindus still remained as the majority. (What adamant and impossible people, the Hindus!).

Now, if the British were to leave and make India a democracy, it is not going to be a Muslim majority rule, and in the eyes of the Muslims, it is simply going to be a Hindu rule. They never realised and will never realise that a Hindu rule can never be like the Muslim rule, as the very Philosophy of Hindu Dharma teaches secularism and co-existence, with the distinct epistemology of oneness and togetherness. This had been proved and also is being demonstrated through time.

And it is at this point that Aga Khan's cunningness works meticulously. His strategies were right, but unfortunately, he was a romantic himself like the Max Muller, who romanticised about an 'Aryan Invasion' which had filtered into history and filled the minds of people like Hitler with hate Philosophy and Differential Epistemology to make a world war to kill many human beings. Aga Khan romanticised about a great empire, consisting of India, Iran Afghanistan, Egypt, Turkey etc. Unlike Jamaluddin, Aga Khan's empire was a strategy, to make the Hindu majority into a minority by bringing all these adjacent Muslim areas into the fold of India as a confederation.

In 1918, Aga Khan publishes a book, "India in Transition: A Study in Political Evolution" simultaneously from England and India. This book is the prime source of his romantic dream, apart from his many activities. He begins with a premise that India, "with her vast population, her varied provinces and races, her many sectarian differences" can never become a "unilateral form of free government" (22). The constitutional reforms could only work out if and only if all provinces in India could be so trained to become members of a federation, with considerable autonomy as it may be in the case of the United States, he argues. "..... for some years to come each Indian province in the critical stage of federalism, must have a constitution that provides, on the one hand, for an independent and strong executive, responsible to the Viceroy and the secretary of the state for tenure of office and appointment; and, on the other, for elective assemblies to control finance and legislation. Thus it becomes possible to build up the future United States of India within the British Empire". (23).

Aga Khan had very definite ideas about the provinces that should become federations. He disapproved of the existing suggestions of provinces, and said: "the suggested sub division of the existing provinces into a considerable number of self-governing states" will not work out. Because "such small administrations would unduly narrow down national effort". He wanted the provinces to be of the size of "at least to a medium European state". He thinks that the size of Bengal could be an example, which is "suitable and reasonably homogenous". Two or three states of the west could be handed over to the Punjab, since they "belong by affinity", and Sindh with Baluchistan could become an Indus province with Quetta as the head quarters (24).

Like many, Aga Khan also had a European model in his mind. He explicitly says this: "by such a scheme of redistribution, there would be much greater approximation than at present to provinces which could honestly be called nationalities, each having an importance and coherence ranking with those of at least some European states" (25).

For Aga Khan, the creation of an Indian federation was only the beginning. From this point on, his romantic dreams are simply let loose; to a fantastic level. He expresses his confidence that once this "internal" federation becomes a reality; it is going to be a strong one, both economically and

otherwise. He is confident that Afghanistan would naturally “seek association” with the newly found and strong Indian federation, and further, groups of small principalities from Arabia and Persian Gulf would reasonably become the members. He says that this shall be natural, for “peace and liberty, freedom and order”. And once this much happens, Persia, would naturally be attracted to become a member of the federation(26). Further, it shall again be natural for Nepal, Bhutan and Tibet also to join the federation in time. In the south, there shall yet be a natural phenomena from Ceylon, who was “naturally and historically” a part of India.(27). Such an India will be “a progressive, satisfied and happy India” and this would be “the strongest pillar, next to the United Kingdom, of the British Empire”.(28)

Aga Khan was confident at many points. On the first place, he was confident that others will be attracted to join the federation as a matter of course, naturally, like the expectation of Karl Marx himself of society becoming polarised into Bourgeoisie and Proletariats with the contradictory relations with the claim of a materialistic conception of history, and predicted so many things as a scientific outcome of it, and Aga Khan makes this implicit prediction as a natural course. His problem was simply the usual problem with any Muslim intellectual of that time, of losing Muslim India from the hands of Muslims. To the Muslim mind, India was a Muslim Empire, ignoring all other Hindu Kingdoms and the formidable challenge to Muslim rule from all of them. The Muslims had also been crafty enough to claim ownership to many Indian fortresses and monuments, through restructuring and reconstructing them from time to time, and the historians, predominantly western and then subsequently communists, had put into record as them being the creation of the Muslim rulers. As time went by, the myth of Muslims erecting huge fortresses and monuments became a reality with all and the Muslim intellectuals were drunk in the glory of their rule in India, which was akin to the drunkenness of Hitler, in the Aryan race theory, which was yet another spurious one. Aga Khan could clearly see that, should the British leave India, then the Muslims as such are never going to be the ‘rulers’ of India, they could be just like any others in India. Losing their special place was intolerable to them, at least they wished to think that they had been special and they had special place in India; so the only way for them was to claim that Muslims are a nation separate. It is in this backdrop that Aga Khan is trying to work out another strategy of Muslim domination. Let Hindus and all others be there, let India not be separated into Hindu and Muslim India, but still, there could be Muslim domination eventually. With all the provinces as he imagined becoming members of federation, it shall be a comfortable Muslim dominated ‘empire’ and through the glories projected as those of the Muslim rulers; they could maintain the ultimate domination of the ‘United States of India’. However, the secret plan of Aga Khan could not work out, but he did succeed almost fully into making most Indian leaders believe that he was not for Muslim separatism and Muslim fundamentalism, which gave him acceptance to many Indian minds. They looked at his idea of federation from just an Indian perspective, and never from a Muslim perspective, which was really the case. Indeed, this was very cunning, and what appeared simply as a romantic dream could have been extremely dangerous: through the inherent epistemology of differences would never let the Muslim society co-exist in peace and harmony, should there be any iota of difference either in terms of language, race, sect or geography.

The Indian Muslims were already thinking that it is impossible for Muslims to live with Hindus for the present, and with any one else for that matter which had been implicitly and explicitly present

in their thoughts. As it had been experienced later, as a matter of fact the Muslims had shown such intolerance that one sect, linguistic group or tribe could not live with the other, and God alone knows what differences they had been working out even within the stipulated homogenous groups. But for the time, it was only against the Hindus.

Sir Arthur Keith makes a note of this and puts it into record some where in 1919. according to him: "Among the Muslims there was propagated a wild but not negligible scheme for the creation of a Muslim state based on Afghanistan and embracing all those north western areas where the faith is strong". And he himself adds: "Such a state would inevitably form a permanent source of danger to India. (29). Among many 'predictions' from many people, this had been proved right through the time that followed till now. It had not happened that Afghanistan to become the nucleolus of the Muslim nation, interestingly, even in those days of Hindu hatred, they could not find themselves collective or together to become anything formidable. Further, as a matter of record, no one else and no other Muslim nation wished to join the new Pakistan, which was designed to be a holy land out of what they got from India. No one gave them any territories, and no one else joined them. But had the prediction of Keith been the case, had Afghanistan joined them, then such a nation could have been indeed more dangerous than the present day Pakistan. Keith predicted that such a nation could be a permanent source of danger to India, but it had become a permanent source of danger to the entire world through both terrorism and abetting terrorism. Afghanistan had gone to such extremes that they could not live together among themselves again, and their internal conflicts had invited outsiders to step into their matters, without which, it had become to that extent that they would all kill one another. The thoughts of Muslim state had actually been realised, but then the internal differences went on and on, to make it into today's terrorism.

Abdul Qadir Bilgrami

The Hindu Muslim differences kept growing, and it was now entering into all kinds of practices of both religions. The Muslims started hating many Hindu practices, and the Hindus started hating many Muslim practices. With such attitude and perception of one another, leave alone different religions, nothing whatsoever can co-exist. Undoubtedly, unrest and communal riots had to be a natural phenomenon. Some of the records of that time shall show how silly these differences were, but how serious they were becoming.

Zulkarnain, an Urdu journal from Badayun of the United Provinces published a letter to Mahatma Gandhi in the March and April issues of the 1920. The letter was from a Muslim, representing himself for the entire Muslim community, who called himself Muhammad Abdul Qadir Bilgrami. His real name was Muhammad Azizuddin Ahmad Bilgrami, a student from Aligarh College, and then serving in the United Province Civil Service. He changed his name in the letter since Government did not allow civil servants to involve in politics and publish articles. Later, this Bilgrami became a minister in the Bharatpur state. The letter/Article was reprinted in 1925. (30) It was of 62 pages, and the original full letter was published from Badayun in 1922 (31). Some aspects from the letter:-

“Mahatmaji, no problem in Indian politics is as important as that of Hindu-Muslim Unity, because it is one of the accepted facts that the success of all schemes for the future welfare and progress of this country depends on this, that the two nations treat each other with tolerance (32). He claims that “I am not opposed to Hindu-Muslim Unity” since, according to what he says, “in my opinion, the welfare of this country depends on the two nations working together in politics” (33).

He had already declared that the Muslims are a separate nation from the Hindus, and what he speaks of is the working together of the ‘two nations’. For the next 53 pages of his letter, that is pages 5 to 58, he argues justifying ‘cow slaughter’ by the Muslims. One of the immediate reasons to communal riots used to be this: some Muslims shall kill a cow to eat in a Hindu area and make a public demonstration of it, and the Hindus treat cow as holy, and there will be a clash between the two groups. Bilgrami touches this point and goes on justifying killing of the cow by the Muslims. Though he claims that his letter is aimed at Hindu Muslim unity, the letter does just the opposite, it is effected in increasing communal tensions. He further says that “it is our belief that the Hindus are heretics (kafirs) and polytheists (mushrik), and we are forbidden by our religion to entertain any feeling of friendship or affection for them In the light of these divine injunctions, the Hindus should not expect the Muslims to ever to behave towards them with genuine love.(34) As for the cow slaughtering, he says that “Every person has the right to choose the animal he wants to slaughter; but if any Muslim, at the time of choosing the animal, takes into consideration the possibility of pleasing the Hindus, and decides to sacrifice a goat with the intention that this act will be looked upon by the Hindus with appreciation and will become a means of effecting closer relationship and mutual unity, then his sacrificial offering will no longer be purely in the way of God, and will not be acceptable in the eyes of the Sharia (Muslim law)” (35).

Many Muslim leaders had appealed to the Muslims to voluntarily give up cow slaughtering in the light of the Hindu sentiments. Bilgrami says that all of them are “ignorant by the standard of Sharia” (36) He even mentions the names of the so called ignorant Muslims who try to make peace with the Hindus such as Mushir Hussain Qidwai, Mazharul Huq, Hasrat Mohani, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Muhamad Ali, Shawkat Ali, Mawlana Abdul Bari Farangimahalli etc. The next 8 pages in his letter he pleads that cow must be slaughtered, how desirable it is to slaughter cow, through quoting several verses from the Quran and that of the prophet. He goes on telling the Gandhi “Therefore, when the Hindus insist on putting a stop to sacrifice, and we are compelled, for your sake, not to slaughter a particular animal whom you worship, it becomes religiously binding upon us to sacrifice the cow, in place of a goat, lest our right might be lost through want of practice”(37).His conclusion becomes even more interesting, “if a person sacrifices a cow with the avowed purpose of hurting the feelings of the Hindus, there is nothing objectionable in it” (38).

All these arrogances and hatred towards the Hindus and discomfort with anything that is not Muslim clearly comes out as he went on writing the so called open letter to Mahatma Gandhi. Then he also sums up the average and general feelings of Muslims towards the others, here, the Hindus in particular. “It is clear that in the present age, it is impossible for us to stop with force the falsehood-worship of another nation. That leaves us only two ways: to express in ways the evil of the practices of the kafirs, and to have a hatred for them in our hearts”(39). this letter, which was not a letter in reality, an article as a matter of fact in the form of a letter to Mahatma Gandhi was much celebrated during those days. Mahatma Gandhi became the target since to many Muslim

minds, Gandhi stood for and by the Hindus, as Indian National congress stood for Hindu Nationalism. A person like Gandhi, who had strived constantly to transcend the so called boundaries of religion was taken to be a religiously confined man! Gandhi was one of those Indians who wanted to be Hindu, Christian, Muslim and all such things at the same time, sincerely not only respecting other faiths, but also accepting all of them in genuine terms.

But then, there is this theological problem, and this epistemological difficulty. Semitic theologies normally teach that theirs is the only right faith, and all others are wrong. It must take a civilisation to polish the arrogance within this theory, as it had happened to Christianity; to co exist with people of other faiths, respecting them. In Islam, such sort of an evolution of civilisation had not occurred; and on the contrary, their so called religious leaders simply tried to take the Muslim back in time to the Arabia of the days of the Prophet. They were trying for this and succeeded to a large extent wherever we see the Muslim majority, especially with lesser chances of interaction with non-Muslims. For a religion which teaches to disbelieve others to the point of disliking, it is impossible to speak of some thing like a secularism, a term which comes to be used much in today's world. Gandhi being basically a Hindu, it was easy and natural for him to accept and respect other faiths, because, on the one hand, the Hindu Dharma never forbid such things, and on the other hand, it had been teaching for centuries that 'there can only be one truth, though scholars may call it through different names'. Epistemologically, Muslims can never comprehend this attitude, and they simply disbelieved that it is possible for any one to 'respect' the other faith, and they thought that the Gandhi was simply acting as a Hindu agent to deceive the Muslims. And that is why, most likely, the letter of Bilgrami which begins with decency, ends up in bitter hatred and contempt towards the Hindus. And the communal Gulf kept widening, with no hope ever to bridge it.

The Hindu - Muslim rift got an official face/phase with the inception of the All India Muslim League, aided as well as inspired by Lord Curzon, founded under the patronage of Salimullah, the Dhaka Nawab, and as Aga Khan as the first president, who continued till 1912, on the 30th of December, 1906. It was a long awaited dream and aspiration of many Muslim intellectuals, and as some historians wanted to believe, it was not created for a Hindu-Muslim friendship. The only attempt to bridge Hindu Muslim gap came through the Lucknow pact of 1916, in which the Muslims were given the lion's share as some of the historians feel (40). Many Muslim leaders felt that the Lucknow pact was totally unacceptable, and insisted that the Muslims must reject it and they should have nothing to do with the Hindus at all. Thus in spite of the Lucknow pact, nothing had changed much except in papers for some.

Then comes the Khilafat, which Mahatma Gandhi thought as the one and only opportunity for a Hindu Muslim gap filling. As a matter of fact, India or Indian Muslims have nothing much to do with the Khilafat, which is a political issue concerning the ruler of Turkey. Turkey was ruled by the Caliph, a Muslim spiritual leader, whom Indian Muslims had never thought of as their spiritual pontiff. The Caliph's Caliphate consists of Armenia, Smyrna and Kurdistan, apart from Turkey. In the First World War, the ruler took an anti British stand, and got defeated in the war. Then comes the treaty of Severs, which Turkey had to abide, thus loosing the areas mentioned above. One must remember that it was this Caliphate that used to be known as the 'sick man of Europe' during those days, an expression coined by the Czar of Russia, perhaps correctly. Turkey had been

unlawfully holding a number of non Turkish states under their hegemony. The world powers were waiting for an opportunity to pin down the Caliph, and now he found himself in troubled waters. When the Europeans were turning against a Muslim ruler, the Caliph gave the wanted twist for Muslims to feel that a Muslim ruler who was also a spiritual leader is getting troubled by non Muslims to destroy a Muslim state and to start an agitation against the British in particular, which becomes the Khilafat movement.

Indeed the western powers wished to bury the Caliphate for good (41). This awoke the Muslim sentiments the world over, and then began the Khilafat movement. Indian Muslims were already worried about the possibility of a Hindu rule, and they were convinced that their glorious days are going to be over. They carried the permanent feeling that all others are against Islam, which they still do with vigour. Thus Turkish Caliphate became so dear to them at once, and the Indian Muslim leaders also wanted to be a party to the Khilafat (42). In 1918, the Muslim League organised a meeting with the National Congress at Delhi with Dr. Ansari as the Chairman of the League's reception committee. He denounced Sharif Hussain of Mecca for revolting against the Caliph, and demanded that the integrity and autonomy of the Muslim states must be maintained. The congress supported these views, and the Chairman of the Congress reception Committee, Hakim Ajmal Khan (a Muslim was deliberately put here as the Congress policy of appeasing the Muslims) shared the sentiments of Dr. Ansari.

Mawlana Muhamad Ali and his brother Shaukat Ali with some Muslim followers went to Gandhi for help to lead a mass Khilafat movement in India in support of the Turkish Caliph. Gandhi knew very well that India has nothing to do with the matters concerning Turkey, as well as Indian Muslims have nothing to do with the Caliph: But he thought this as a God given opportunity to further appease the Muslims towards a Hindu-Muslim unity. On the 11th of May 1921 Gandhi wrote in his 'Young India' that 'the Khilafat question gave the Hindus and the Muslims the opportunity of a life time to unite'. Gandhi further insisted that "if the Hindus wish to cultivate the eternal friendship with the Musalmans, they must perish with them in the attempt to vindicate the honour of Islam". Gandhi seems to have been innocently convinced that by doing so, the Muslims would love all Hindus back!

But many national leaders advised Gandhi not to jump into the Khilafat movement, and when he remained stubborn in the hope that this shall bridge the Hindu Muslim gap, many abstained from the Khilafat. Bal Gangadhar Tilak did not approve of it. He was very apprehensive of involving in an issue which is not the concern of Indian Nationalism and which involves Muslim fundamentalism (43). Interestingly, Muhammad Ali Jinnah also opposed Gandhi and even "warned Gandhiji not to encourage the fanaticism of the Muslim religious leaders and their followers"(44). He too was all against involving in an international problem and internationalising Indian Muslims. Even Aurangzeb, the most orthodox of the Muslim rulers of India had never seen the Turkey Caliph as a spiritual leader of the Muslims. "the theory that the Muslim ruler of Turkey is the spiritual head of all Muhammadans, is a creation of the late nineteenth century, and merely a result of a political pan-Islamic movement as a natural reaction against the steady absorption of all sovereign Muslim states by the Christians"(45). RC Majumdar also says "Gandhi failed to realise that the pan-Islamic idea, which inspired the Khilafat question would cut at the very root of Indian nationalism. If the 'real sympathy and vital interest' of a large section of Indians were bound up

with a state and society which lay far out side the boundaries of India with which it had no connections, they could never form a true unit of Indian nation. If a hundred million Muslims were vitally interested in the fate of Turkey, and other Muslim states out side India, they could have been hardly regarded as a unit of India. By his own admission that the Khilafat question was a vital one for Indian Muslims, Gandhi himself admitted in a way that they formed a separate nation. The fact of the matter is that the Indian Muslims were 'in' India, but not 'of' India (46).

These are some instances when Gandhi uses less reason and more emotion in the running of a state of affairs. He had not listened to any one, and went ahead with the movement in toto. Gandhi had combined the Khilafat with his non-cooperation movement, which in fact went ahead as a combined one. The timing here was just correct, the Prince of Wales was to visit India. Gandhi asked Indians to boycott the visit of the Prince as a non cooperative instrument, which put the Viceroy in troubled waters. Empty streets and closed windows and doors shall welcome the Prince, which shall be nothing short of a suicide for the Viceroy. England's heir has to ride in pomp and full splendour through empty Indian streets. Lord Reading, the Viceroy was ready for anything to avoid the situation. He decided to call a 'round table' conference in which he himself shall be representing the British government, and offered full provincial autonomy and to discuss the possibilities of Diarchy at the centre. This indeed was a golden opportunity for the Indian nationalists to find a good say in the governance of the nation, and naturally Gandhi was to accept the offer and go for the discussion.

But this did not work out. Some Muslim leaders approached him and asked him not to go for the round table. Reading had offered amnesty to all political prisoners who were in jail for various reasons, but he kept his reservations for the Ali brothers who were some different category prisoners than the others(47). The Muslims put pressure on Gandhi that unless the Ali brothers are also released like others, Gandhi should not attend the Round Table, and Gandhi decided not to go for the discussions. This indeed was a big blunder committed by Gandhi, which could not be repaired at all. Many national leaders were utterly disappointed and much angry, CR Das said; "the chance of a whole life time had been lost" (48).

KM Munshi makes an analysis of this. Though there is no point in speculating about what might have happened had Gandhi attended the RTC, it is necessary for historical judgements. Had Gandhi accepted the offer, then India would have got dominant status before 1939, without having to partition the land. Perhaps the India Pakistan division could have been avoided. This indeed was a big political as well as cultural mistake. The people of Turkey themselves were not interested in the Khilafat movement and to prolong the Caliphate, and with the rise of Mustafa Kemal Pasha, the Caliphate became buried for good. Pasha out rightly discards the very concept of Ottoman Empire and describes it as a "crazy structure based on broken religious foundations". He had abolished the Khilafat as well in 1924, calling it as a stinking relic of history. The activities of Aga Khan had infuriated Pasha, and spoke about him as the Emperor without Empire, who floated safely on the vast ocean of India's national movement without having done anything for the nation's cause. Ataturk even called him as a special agent of the English (49). Though the Khilafat had become a comic affair to the entire world, with the support from Gandhi, it had become a serious matter within India!

Nathuram Vinayak Godse was very critical of Gandhi in this entire affair. He gave the opinion that even though all previous attempt of a Hindu Muslim unity had been absolute failure, Gandhi continued to be “stubborn in pursuit of his phantom of Hindu Muslim unity” (50). One may find it extremely difficult to believe that Gandhi had openly supported Muhammad Ali’s invitation to the Amir of Afghanistan to invade India and capture it from the anti Muslim British rule. He called upon all Muslims to help and support the Muslim invader should this happen, as it is only the duty of all Muslims. (51). Ravindra Nath Tagore, the famous poet and Nobel laureate said that most of the Muslims were Muslim nationals than National Muslims. He believed that if any Muslim nation attacks India, the Muslims will side them in the name of Muslim brotherhood and denounce India. The ‘Times of India’ wrote an article basing on an interview with Tagore on the 18th of April 1924. It reads: “..... Another very important factor which, according to the poet, was making it almost impossible for Hindu Muhammadan unity to become an accomplished fact was that the Muhammadans could not confine their patriotism to any one country The poet said that he had very frankly asked many Muhammadans whether, in the event of any Muhammadan power invading India, they would stand side by side with their Hindu neighbours to defend their common land. He could not be satisfied with the reply he got from them. He said that he could definitely state that even such men as Mr Muhammad Ali had declared that under no circumstances was it permissible for any Muhammadan whatever his country might be, to stand against any other Muhammadan”.

None of these were of any consideration to the Gandhi. Supporting the idea and conspiracy behind an Afghan invasion, he said that “I can not understand that why Ali brothers are going to be arrested as the rumours go, and why I am to remain free. They have done nothing, which I would not do. If they had sent a message to the Amir, I also would send one to inform the Amir that if he came, no Indians so long as I can help it, would help the government to drive him back” (52). The non cooperation cum Khilafat movement was on, and the Prince’s visit was nearing. Gandhi was not at all yielding, and then the British changed sides from Gandhi to the Muslims, in their utter diplomacy. They knew that it would be easy to get the Muslims on their side and end the non cooperative movement along with Khilafat, if they could please the Muslims, which they did meticulously. Lord Reading published a telegram which he said is a copy of one he had sent to Montague in England. This telegram was urging the need of evacuating Constantinople, continuing the Sultan’s sovereignty over the holy places and the restoring the Ottoman Thrace including the sacred Muslim city of Adrianople and the unreserved restoration of Smyrna. (53).

Such publishing of an official document is normally uncalled for, and is not done. Evidently, this was to be a trick, and no Muslim leader ever thought about it, and they fell headlong into the British plot of ending the Khilafat cum non cooperation movement. Suddenly the Muslims got convinced that their demands are met with, and over night they abandoned the Khilafat to become pro British. They turned their back to Gandhi, and he was bitterly let down by the Muslims. But all these and more had never changed the Gandhi; he kept hoping and praying for a Hindu Muslim unity, even when Pakistan had become an un avoidable reality, he continued his hopes and prayers for a Hindu Muslim unity. Perhaps this was very characteristic of him only, the Gandhi. The Khilafat, which was aimed at bridging the Hindu Muslim gap, failed miserably, and as a matter of fact, it had widened the gap. Initially the Hindus and Muslims worked together as Gandhi

launched non cooperation and Khilafat together, but when the Muslims ditched Gandhi, it resulted in communal riots and furthered hatred among both the communities. What an unfortunate culmination of a much expected incident!

Some of the premises that ran among the Muslims were very much indicative of future Jihadi Terrorism. The dictum, that one is a Muslim first and then only anything else was one such 'faith'. Undoubtedly, such things were creations of intellectuals only, but they went deep into the culture of Muslims, and became something of a tradition to them. The Ali brothers, for whose sake the Gandhi had to forgo the British offer of a near home rule, openly declared that they are first Muslims and then only Indians. This indeed amounts to the Aristotelian fallacy of hysteron-proteron, of putting the cart before the horse. This had descended into many places subsequently. In my younger days, I happened to ask a Bengali Muslim whether he is a Bengali or not. This man had come to my home to do some work, and since I could speak Bengali, I thought of talking to him in his mother tongue; so I asked the question. He answered in the negative, and told me that he is a Muslim. I tried to reason with him to say that I was not asking his religion, but the language he speaks as mother tongue, but failed to drive home the point. He kept insisting that he is Muslim. Yet another is an experience with a Srilankan, whom I asked whether or not he is Tamil. This time too, since I could also speak Tamil, my intention was to speak to him in his mother tongue. He too answered in the negative, saying that he is a Muslim. Then I was confused, whether this man speaks Tamil or Sinhalese, and found that his mother tongue is Tamil. If the same question is asked to any one else, he would be speaking either of his linguistic identity or nationality, certainly not in terms of his religion. The dictum that originated in India, that one is first a Muslim and then only an Indian, destroys Indian nationalism, and excludes the Muslims automatically from anything that is Indian at once. This theory had gone deep into the minds of common Muslims, and is still precipitating, as my experience speaks of. The Bengali Muslim leader, Abdul Karim, puts this in mild words: "The Musalmans of India owe allegiance to Islam in respect of religious principles, to their countrymen in respect of social obligations and to the particular party of which they are members in respect of political ideas. A Musalman in his country cannot, therefore say, that he is an Indian first and Musalman next. All that he can say is he is an Indian Musalman first and a member of the wider Islamic brotherhood afterwards". (54).

If we think about the situation, we can see that such epistemologies can simply destroy the world through hate philosophies and differences. It shall become impossible for one religion to co exist with another. But, then, shall I say fortunately?, that it had been proven through history in subsequent days of the so called Muslim glory in India, that Muslims themselves had become the victims of this epistemology of differences and hate philosophy. In all Muslim countries there is unrest, and infight among the Muslims themselves in the names of all kinds of 'reasons', be it language, ethnicity, or different sects within Islam. As a matter of philosophy, epistemology does not get over ridden at will. If one belongs to the epistemology of differences, then it can not be stopped at will at some fine point. The epistemology of difference is an on going process, ad-infinitum, which can only lead to the fallacy of infinite regress. Hence it had been only a natural course for the Muslims who are fed and initiated into the epistemology of differences and hate philosophy by the Indian Muslim intellectuals to keep finding differences with others first, and then

among themselves, and the reasons to which shall also be keep developing from time to time, through the ultimate support from misinterpretation of their religious scriptures.

The epistemology of differences and hate philosophy which began through intellectuals like Sayyid Ahmad Khan and others in the post 1857 period had resulted in the counter Hindu campaign as well. Every Hindu did not think like Mahatma Gandhi and remained hopeful of some possibility of a Hindu Muslim unity some where in future. The Hindu counter theories were even stronger. Swami Birajik wrote on 1st May, 1924: "The struggle for swaraj (home rule) is mainly a struggle of the Hindus, because this country belongs to the Hindus. Its name is Hindustan. All its mountains, rivers and holy places have got Hindu names. The outside world also calls the Christians and Muhammadans of India Hindus Hindu community is the chief community with which all other communities will be amalgamated by means of ShuddhiI assure you that today the greatest religion of India is nationalism. The people who go against the spirit of nationalism shall be expelled for good from India." (55) Lala Har Dayal says: "Hindu sangathan should make it their principle to give their national jewels (aspects of Indian culture, literature, philosophy etc.) to every Indian child, whether Muhammadan or Christian. If the followers of other religion refuse to follow them and spread disaffection in the country, they should be opposed by law, or sent back to the Arabian Desert to eat dates. What right they have to eat mangoes or oranges of our India?"(56).He further says: "..... Islam is such a curious religion that Muhammadans cannot live conjointly with other nations in any part of the world. Even 20% of Islam creates agitation and disturbances Islam can never mix with other nations and religions. This is a historical truth"(57). The Hindu 'counter terrorism' had been taking roots in a Muslim threatened India. The famous Hindu tolerance was perhaps reaching its zenith from where it had now to retaliate for existence.

By now, the Muslims were laying down their demands as minimum terms on which they would be prepared to co operate in the working of a self government. In October 1924, they came out with four such conditions. (1), The number of seats for Muslims in legislature and all other elected bodies be fixed in excess of the present number, preserving the existing system of separate electorates, (2), The number of Muslims in all public services should be fixed, and the proportion be not less than one-third, with posts open to competition to be similarly apportioned, (3), Some special facilities be provided for Muslim education, (4), Muslims should enjoy absolute liberty with regard to their religious duties and their performance. (58).

The Hindu Muslim quarrel had gone deeper into the minds of both community, and the intellectuals really made a mess of common people living in friendship and harmony. Now, it had simply become impossible for these two communities ever to live together. There now is no way, other than the making of an Islamic state, and getting the lot out, for all others to live in peace. Subsequently, in 1947, the division of India took place, and there emerged a Muslim nation with the name Pakistan (Paki = pure), which was supposed to live in peace and harmony within themselves in the least, that the history proved wrong. In India, there remained many Muslims even when they carved out an area from India, and did not go to Pakistan, whose number is more than the total population in Pakistan.

With all the attempts to a Hindu Muslim unity ever failing on and on, and now the Hindus also becoming closer to Muslim attitude of uncompromising in matters of religion, the Muslims now became careful and more to the point of their desire of a Dar-ul-Islam. In the past, when the Muslims were in the rule, they were habitual of taking the Hindus for granted and also for a ride at times as it pleased them, but with the coming of the British, and with the end of Muslim rule, the Muslims lost their special status and privileges. There was just one thing left for them and that was to strongly work towards a separate Muslim nation by carving out areas from India. From this time on, demands for separate Muslim nation started becoming stronger. Perhaps one of the first Muslim to have demanded a separate Muslim nation in explicit terms is one Nadir Ali of Agra, who is reported to have been a practicing lawyer. Nadir Ali published a pamphlet in which he argued "as one of the method of settlement of Hindu Muslim problem he discussed partition of India" (59). But the details of this pamphlet is not available. What is available to us is only reference made by Khaliqzaman.

Hasrat Mohani was a versatile personality. He was a poet, a powerful prose writer, and a journalist. Mohani had been member to almost all political parties and also occupied important offices in them. First he joined the Indian National Congress, and then the Khilafat Conference. Then he joined the All India Muslim League, and finally landed up in the Communist Party of India (60).

In 1921 annual session of the Muslim League at Ahammadabad, Mohani spoke of a complete independent India during his presidential address, emphasising the place of Muslims in it. He said that full home rule alone is not sufficient from the Muslim perspective. "it is not enough that we should stand for complete independence alone", it becomes "necessary to decide upon the form that it should take, and, in my opinion, it can only be an Indian republic on the lines of the United States of America". He says that the Muslims "suspect that on the achievement of self government the Hindus will acquire greater political powers and will use their numerical superiority to crush the Musalmans". "the generality of the Musalmans with a few exceptions are afraid of the numerical superiority of the Hindus and are absolutely opposed to an ordinary reform scheme as a substitute for complete independence". He speaks of a "double subjugation" for the Muslims, one that under the British rule which is commonly shared by both Hindus and Muslims, and another that of the slavery from a Hindu majority India. The second subjugation he says is "to the Hindu majority which they will have to face in every department of the Government". Yet he thinks in terms of a federal republic, because "while the Musalmans, as a whole, are in a minority in India; yet nature has provided a compensation; the Musalmans are not in a minority in all the provinces. In some provinces such as Kashmir, the Punjab, Sindh, Bengal and in Assam (61), the Musalmans are more numerous than the Hindus. In the 'United States of India' the Hindu majority in Madras, Bombay and united provinces will not be allowed to overstep the limits of moderation against the Musalmans"(62).

Here we find Mohani trying to solve the Hindu Muslim problems without actually asking for a totally separate Muslim nation. He was not sure of actually obtaining an independent Muslim state, so he was thinking in terms of getting maximum for the Muslims within the available frame work. Jinnah

even was trying for the same, and the creation of Pakistan was unexpected for him and once he found an independent Pakistan, he started realising the impossibility in forming a nation out of it with all kinds of 'different' people, though they all are Muslims! Mohani thinks in terms of counter balancing the Hindu majority states with the Muslim majority states; an option which he himself abandons later. Later he started feeling that even if there are Muslim majority provinces which shall be totally under the Muslim rule, there still will be a central government, where he thought that the Hindus are going to dominate the Muslims. Three years later we see that Mohani is asking for a 'bi-communal' federal state, where "Muslim states united with Hindu states under a national federal government of India". The federal government shall be the "Supreme National Government composed of Hindus and Muslims" (63).

This however was the stepping stone towards the two nation theory put forward by the Muslim leadership. The idea of 'bi-communal' state was first officially demanded at the 1945 Simla conference and that Jinnah had began to raise from 1939, which could also be seen as sowing the seed of the two nation theory. The Indian Muslims slowly started demanding for a separate nation, from the ideas sown by people like Sayyid Ahmad Khan that the Muslims are a separate nation. They were now refusing complete autonomy of a federal system that they themselves had been contemplating for some time. Interestingly, all these were the problems exclusively from the Muslims, and neither the Hindus, nor the Sikhs, Jains, Buddhist, Christians and Jews had anything to do with this. No one else in India had the problem of insecurity as the Muslim leaders were projecting for the Muslims, and no other religion had any difficulties in co existing with any one else. The Jews, who had been persecuted the world over for two thousand years lived and still lives comfortably in India. India is the only place in the entire world where the Jews could live safely and with full freedom to practice their religion even in the days of their hard experience. The Jews built huge synagogues in India which still stands in glory in the south of India, Kochi. No other religion in the entire world had any problems or difficulties to live in India which had always been a society of multiple faith systems, and the plurality and multiplicity of faith systems and rituals even within the Hindu Dharma itself is significant. But the Muslims alone had problems, the Muslim intellectuals alone spent their lives in creating theories of differences and hatred towards all others and projected the dream that once Muslims are separate from non Muslims, it is just going to be heaven itself. History indeed speaks volumes about this heaven, which 'are' right in front of our eyes! It is our experience that over the period in time, where ever the Muslims happen to be in majority, they were becoming more and more narrow in their out looks as well as perspectives. The intellectuals are becoming more fanatics and intolerable to others. And now terrorism too.

Wahabuddin Kamboh

The significance of Wahabuddin Kamboh is that he had imagined a separate Muslim nation carved out from India, which he even named as 'Nuristan'. He suggested of a separate Muslim state, his Nuristan, which shall be a separated Muslim nation with the Muslim majority provinces in the North West. He made this suggestion in 1923.

One of the ancestors of Wahabuddin wrote the popular book 'Bahar-i-Danish'. His name was Shaikh Enayatullah, who was a 'mir munshi' in the court of Shah Jahan. Another ancestor, one Muhammad Saleh was the 'divan' of the Lahore province. With the end of the Mughal glory, the family lost their estates and shifted to a place near Amritsar called Hir Kamboh, and started farming to earn their living. Towards the end of nineteenth century, Wahabuddin's father joined the Punjab Police, and died while in service, and the job, thus came to Wahabuddin in harness. He was still in school at that time. Wahabuddin finally retired as a Sub Inspector, in 1934. He then went back to his village near Amritsar, but joined a small group that was propagating the Pakistan idea in 1938, in Lahore. When India was divided, he left India and went to Pakistan, lived in Lyallpur, and died on 11th October, 1964.

He had written a book, 'Tarik-i-Kambohan', which became popular and ran into three editions. In Punjab, near Amritsar, he had personally been seeing the Hindu Muslim riots. During the rioting, it is not just to put the blame on any one community alone in spite of the Muslim history of separatism and hate theory, there were blood shed on either side. Most of the communal riots began with one problem, some Muslim shall slaughter a cow in a Hindu area or make a big deal about the cow slaughter, and the Hindus will retaliate. Even in modern times, many of the communal riots began with this very issue of slaughtering the cow. However, Wahabuddin became convinced that it is impossible for the Muslims to live with the Hindus, and so he thought out a plan of dividing India into Hindu and Muslim nations. He had imagined of cutting off the area which is today's Pakistan and form a separate Muslim land. He named it as the 'Nuristan' to mean the land of light. However, he does not say anything about the Muslim majority in the Bengal, perhaps he wrote about what his immediate concern was. (64)

The importance of Wahabuddin simply lies in the fact that he had imagined of the present Pakistan and its area with fine accuracy, and even coined a name for it. Nuristan shall mean the land of light, and when India was divided, the name given to the Muslim nation was Pakistan, which means place of purity. Pak, meaning pure, amounts to the place where only Muslims shall be there without the non believers in Islam, who are Kafirs to them. The question of purity comes from the fact that there shall be no one other than Muslims to 'pollute' the land with other faiths and gods. Perhaps Kamboh's name Nuristan could have been better, which would have been less of a fundamentalist name. But, no other details are available on Kamboh, and the author who wrote about him could not collect the details which he seems to have made promise of, before which he had to die. The writer had actually approached Kamboh for information and a detailed discussion with him and Kamboh agreed to that also. Before the writer could find time to reach Wahabuddin, he dies in a year's time, leaving us no further information.

Sardar Gul Khan

In 1923, there was a committee sent to the North West Frontier Province to enquire into the reforms to be extended to that province. The committee was headed by Sir Denis Brey, who went for direct hearing from the leaders. Sardar Gul Khan was the president of Islamic Anjuman of Dera

Ismail Khan, and when his turn came, he spoke in clear terms that the Muslims can not go on living with the Hindus, and that they want a separate state. One Samarath had written down the exact words of questions and answers in the minority report of that committee. Just one question and its answer by Gul Khan is sufficient to demonstrate the spirit of the Pathan.

“Question: The idea at the back of your Anjuman is the Pan Islamic idea which is that Islam is a league of nations and as such amalgamating this (NWFP) with the Punjab will be detrimental, will be prejudicial, to that idea. That is the dominant idea at the back of those who think with you? Is that so?

Answer: It is so, but I have to add something. Their idea is that the Hindu Muslim unity will never become a fact, it will never become a ‘fact accompli’ and they think that this province should remain separate and link between Islam and Britannic Commonwealth. In fact, when I am asked what my opinion is – I, as a member of the Anjuman, am expressing this opinion – we would much rather see the separation of the Hindus and the Muhammadans, 23 crores of Hindus to the South and 8 crores of Muslims to the North, Give the whole portion from Raskumari (Kanyakumari) to Agra to Hindus and from Agra to Peshawar to Muhammadans, I mean transmigration from one place to the other. This is an idea of exchange. It is not an idea of annihilation” (65).

Gul Khan is implicitly suggesting of ‘annihilation’ if the division is not done. From Agra to Peshawar should go to the Muslims, and the rest to the Hindus and all others. (Agra shall definitely include the Taj Mahal, which the Muslims think as theirs). In fact the question of annihilation he mentions is correct, if the Muslims and Hindus are to live together in the manner as it used to be, there was only one option of killing one another, which shall go on and on. On the one hand the Muslims had already got what they wanted, and went with a Pakistan, and on the other hand, those Muslims who stayed back did so on the basis and experience of their Hindu relations. Muslims from far away places also did not go to the new land, which was bound to be alien to them. And those who went to the new pure land became fish out of water in no time, and became alienated and second class citizens with the nick name of Mohajirs, who still remain alienated from the ‘Muslim main steam’ of Pakistan. How ever, Gul Khan was speaking a truth; if the Muslims did not get what they wanted, it would have simply been blood shed for both.

How ever, it was clear that the thoughts of the Pathan ran into the direction of division of India, and in the purely threatening and bullying pattern of the Pathans, the threat of violence if the division demand is not met with.

Muhammad Ali

With most of the Muslim intellectuals, India remained a fragmented fraternity. Most of them remained convinced that it is just impossible for the Muslims to live with non Muslims, and in case of India, the Hindus. In India, Muslims were not the only minorities, the non-Muslims were much more in number, and the other non-Hindus were lesser in number than the Muslims, like the Christians for instance. India had and still has perhaps all religions of the world, co existing, and co

existing peacefully. Christians and Jews, Sikhs, Jains, Buddhists and the Zoroastrians. But for the Muslims alone, it is impossible to live with others whom they consider as others, including the 'other' sects of Muslims. For the time being in India, all Muslims were seemingly together in the perspective of the impending 'Hindu rule', and the intellectuals went on doing their separatist work of differences.

Muhammad Ali was also convinced in the 'essential disunity' of India. In 1923 he said "unless some new force other than the misleading unity of opposition united this vast continent of India, it will remain a geographical misnomer" (66). It must be noted that Muhammad Ali made this statement in his presidential address to the annual session of the Indian National Congress. The congress party, held Indian nationalism and the unity of India as the important cardinal principle, and the unity of India simply an article of conviction. God alone knows that how many congress men Muhammad Ali must have disappointed through such speeches; there is no way to know that. Congress was convinced in the unity of India, but they did not go into the subtler aspects of this Indian unity. They could not give emphasis to the point that what ever might have been the political situation, India was always culturally one unit and a whole entity. This point was highlighted much later by a party which was formed later, the Bharatiya Janta Party that became popular in short time. On another occasion, Ali told Mahatma Gandhi right up to his face that he is first a Muslim and then only an Indian, or anything else! Even within congress, there used to be many Muslims with this separatism, leave alone the Muslim league, which was formed essentially as a Muslim national party.

The NWFP (North West Frontier Province), which was the Pathan majority place continued to have problems much more than other places. Muhammad Ali made a number of statements in support of a separate state for the Muslims while referring to the NWFP turmoil, which were later quoted by historians of Pakistan in support of the two nation theory. By December, 1924, we find Muhammad Ali supporting a resolution moved in the 16th annual session of the All India Muslim League which was held in Bombay. The resolution demanded that the Government should introduce such reforms in NWFP which would create "a position of equality with the other major provinces of India"(67). The resolution was moved by Sahibzada Aftab Ahmad Khan, seconded by Abdul Aziz of Peshawar, and supported by Muhammad Ali. In the speech Muhammad Ali said: "if a line be drawn from Constantinople to Delhi on the map of the world it would be found that at least right up to Saharanpur there was a corridor of purely Muslim people or Muslims were in clear majority. This gave them the clue for understanding the backward condition in which the frontier and the Punjab were purposely kept by those in power"(68).

We already saw that Lovat Fraser even published such a map of the Muslim corridor. This accusation of Muhammad Ali that indirectly claims that the Muslims all over the world are 'purposely' kept as backward' by no matter who so ever was ruling the Muslims other than the Muslims themselves has to be taken as an important aspect in the Muslim thinking and doing. On the first place, they look at all over the world to search for Muslims just to keep thinking of the actually non existing Muslim fraternity. Then, for all the shortcomings and problems with any Muslim community any where in the world, they simply blame the non Muslims who happen to be in political power. It is customary for them to either hide or ignore the similar or even worse condition of the Muslims in nations where Muslims themselves are the political rulers, and even if

they have to speak about such situations, they would see it as because of some other reasons which shall be found in plenty. Till date this goes on, for all the miseries among the Muslims, it is others to be blamed. Palestine blames Israel for everything, Pakistan blames India for everything, and Muslim nations in general blame America for everything. With the entire civilisation all over the world, the Muslim intellectuals had not learned to look at their mistakes as their mistakes, but put the blame on non Muslims. Some how it is impossible for them to accept their own short comings and mistakes, which becomes the first premise in their self-alienation from non Muslims. And then they would go on with their hate philosophy and epistemology of difference, and separatist theories well articulated for the Muslim minds to remain alienated with the persistent conviction that 'the other is a threat'. This congenital Muslim attitude has been well spelt out by Muhammad Ali: "if this partition was practicable, instead of this suggestion being an indication of the treachery harboured by Muslims against their Hindu neighbours and of the probability of their letting in and assisting a foreign power beyond the frontiers to conquer India, it would rather be an indication that Musalmans had no desire to rule over Hindus, to whom they were willing to consign the whole of India from Agra to Cape Comorin (Kanyakumari). Is that not exactly what the Turkish exchange of population indicates? The Turks were sick of foreign intervention in their affairs on the pretext of securing justice for Christian minorities in Turkey, and in their exasperation they said to Europe: 'We don't want to rule over your Christian minorities. Take them and be done with it. Let us have in exchange the Muslim minorities in Greece, and after that let us develop such area as is left to us, and let Christian Greece and other Christian States in the Balkans develop such areas as they have'. Turkey had despaired of Christian and Muslim unity as some Hindus and Musalmans despair of Hindu and Muslim unity. But despair was anything but indicative of a desire to conquer territories inhabited exclusively by Christians"(69).

Muhammad Ali was definitely influenced by Sardar Gul Khan's theory of inviting a foreign power (Afghanistan in his mind) to invade India, and when such thing happens, the Muslims in India would join the invading army for the sake of the Muslim fraternity. It had already been driven to the Muslim minds that they are first Muslims, and then only Indians or anything else. Hence their nationality is that of "Islam International" and not that of any particular nations. Interestingly, the Communists also hold such an epistemology, they are supposed to be "International" and nationalism is essentially a threat to the "Communist International". Muhammad Ali is not openly supporting the Pathan's view of sponsoring an Afghan invasion in the interest of the Muslims, but he is trying to be 'good' with the non Muslims by 'agreeing' to give away some portion of India for the non Muslims while keeping the earmarked area for the Muslims.

Thus it becomes more than clear that most of the Muslim intellectuals were arguing for separatism, and they were filling the Muslim minds with the theories of separatism intellectually. The notion that Muslims are a nation and it is impossible for them to live with non Muslims were slowly becoming one that of a conviction to the common people, mixed with the desperate hope that once all non Muslim 'impurities' are removed from Muslim societies, the Muslims are going to experience heaven right here under the sun. The concept of a "Dar-ul-Islam" thus became the dream of common Muslims and they were readied to die for that, which had developed subsequently through years to become the terrorism of our contemporary experience.

Who are we to blame thus? The foolish terrorist of a Muslim who is going for suicide missions or the arm chair intellectual who prepares these minds for Jihad? The influence of these arm chair intellectuals to Muslim nations are such, that many such nations like Pakistan actually allow terrorist training camps and abets terrorism. For the present, in case of Pakistan, it had so become that the existence of the very nation of Pakistan is on the edifice of Hindu and India hatred, and the authorities are helpless simply to the compulsion of supporting terrorism and terrorists. A huge section among their society remain convinced that others are enemies of Islam and the existence of Islam itself is threatened, and the only alternative and hope is Jihad, so they begin with Jihadi Terrorism until such time they could actually prepare for a complete Jihad to annihilate all enemies of Islam.

Reference

- 1 H.C. 175. 4S. 6th June, 1907, cols, 890 – 891.
- 2 Quoted in Penderel Moon, “*Gandhi and Modern India*”, London, 1968, p. 276
- 3 CF Andrews, “*Nationalism and Religion*”, The Indian Review, January, 1910, pp. 10 – 11
- 4 *History sheet of Muhammad Ali*, Comp by FH Vincent, Deputy Director of Criminal intelligence, Government of India, quoted in Afzal Iqbal, op.cit., p. 43
- 5 Naqi Muhammad Khan, ‘*Umar-i-Rafta*’, Karachi, 1958, p. 198. Muhammad Sadiq (on Akbar Allahabadi), ‘*A History of Urdu Literature*’, London, 1964, pp. 304 – 315.
- 6 ‘*Comrade*’, 14 January, 1911.
- 7 *Ibid.*, leader entitled ‘*Separate Electorates*’, 28th January, 1911.
- 8 *Ibid.*, leader, 6th January, 1912.
- 9 MA Karandikar, ‘*Islam in India’s Transition to modernity*’, Bombay, 1968, p. 163.
- 10 BR Nanda, ‘*Gokhale, Gandhi and Nehru: Studies in Indian Nationalism*’, London, 1974, p. 17.
- 11 BC Pal, ‘*Nationality and Empire*, Calcutta, 1916, pp. 91 – 96.
- 12 JM Brown, ‘*Gandhi’s rise to Power*’, Cambridge, 1972, p. 139.
- 13 Curzon memorandum to Cabinet on Indian self-government, 2nd June, 1917, *Chamberlain papers*, AC/21/4/23, quoted in Richard Danzig, ‘*The Many-Layered Cake: A Case Study in the Reform of the Indian Empire*’, Modern Asian studies, January 1969, p. 69.
- 14 JH Broomfield, ‘*The Forgotten Majority: The Bengal Muslims and September 1918*’, in DA Low (ed), ‘*Soundings in Modern South Asian History*, London, 1968, p. 218.
- 15 Bambooque, ‘*The Interview*’, *Comrade*, 10th May 1913.
- 16 IH Quereshi, ‘*The Muslim Community*’, The Hague, 1962, p. 296.
- 17 Chaudhary Rahmat Ali, ‘*Pakistan: The Fatherland of Pak Nation*’, Cambridge, 3rd ed 1947, pp. 213 – 214.
- 18 Sayyid Abid Ahmad Ali, ‘*Quaid-i-Azam and Aligarh*’ in Jamaluddin Ahmad (comp), ‘*Quaid-i-Azam as Seen by His Contemporaries*’, Lahore, 1966, p. 194.
- 19 AIML Council Resolution No.6 of 29. September. 1940. ‘*Resolutions of the All India Muslim League from April 1940 to April 1941*’, Delhi, n.d. p. 24.
- 20 Full text of the letter in G.Allana (ed), ‘*Pakistan Movement: Historic Documents*’, pp. 177 – 178. The capitals are in the text. Pirzada also reproduces the letter in SS Pirzada (ed), ‘*Quaid-i-Azam Jinna’s Correspondences*’, Karachi, 2nd Ed, 1966, pp. 175 – 177.
- 21 Syed Abid Ahmad Ali, op.cit., p. 194.
- 22 Aga Khan, ‘*India in Transition: A Study in Political Evolution*’, London, 1918, p.37.
- 23 *Ibid*, pp. 41 – 42.
- 24 *Ibid*, p. 45.
- 25 *Ibid*, p. 46.
- 26 *Ibid*, p. 170.
- 27 *Ibid*, p. 171.
- 28 *Ibid*, p. 301.
- 29 AB Keith, ‘*A Constitutional History of India, 1600 – 1935*’, London, 2nd ed 1936, p. 287.
- 30 Muhammad Abdul Qadir Bilgrami, ‘*Hindu-Muslim Ittihad par Khula Khat Mahatma Gandhi ke Nam*’, printed by Muhammad Muqtadi Khan Sherwani at the Muslim university Press, Aligarh
- 31 SS Pirzada, ‘*The Pakistan Resolution*’ p. 4

- 32 Bilgrami, *'An Open Letter to Mahatma Gandhi'*, reprint of 1925, p. 3]
- 33 *Ibid*, p. 4.
- 34 *Ibid*, p 5 – 6.
- 35 *Ibid*, p. 9.
- 36 *Ibid*, p. 16 – 20.
- 37 *Ibid*, pp. 48 – 49.
- 38 *Ibid*, p. 26.
- 39 *Ibid*, p.54.
- 40 MP Ajithkumar, *'India-Pakistan Relations The Story of a Fractured Fraternity'* , Delhi, 2006, pp. 35 – 36.
- 41 CDM Ketelby, *'A History of Modern Times'*, Bombay, 1979, p. 443. Also see Bernard Lewis, *'The Emergence of Modern Turkey'*, London, 1965, p. 241.
- 42 Tara Chand, *Op. Cit.*, Vol. III, p. 487
- 43 NG Jog, *'Lokamanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak'*, New Delhi, 1979, p. 22.
- 44 KM Munshi *op.cit.* p. 23.
- 45 BR Nanda, *op. cit.*, p. 211
- 46 RC Majumdar, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 50.
- 47 KM Munshi, *op. cit.* p.23
- 48 *Ibid*
- 49 Ajithkumar, *'India Pakistan Relations....'*, Delhi, 2006, p. 40
- 50 Nathuram Godse, *'May it Please Your Honour'*, (Gopal Godse, ed) Delhi, 1989, p.73
- 51 Ajithkumar, p.40
- 52 Nathuram Godse, *op. cit.*, p. 83.
- 53 Tara Chand *op. cit.*, Vol III, p. 504.
- 54 Abdul Karim, *'Letters on Hindu Muslim Pact'*, Calcutta, n.d, p. 13.
- 55 Swami Sat Deo Pal Birajik, in *'Tej'*, Delhi, 1st May, 1924
- 56 Har Dayal, *'Forty-four Months in Germany and Turkey'*, London, 1920, pp. 29 – 54.
- 57 Har Dayal, in *'Tej'*, 26th march, 1925
- 58 Sayyid Sardar Ali Khan, *letter*, *'The Times'*, 25th October, 1924.
- 59 Khaliqzaman, *'Pathway to Pakistan'*, Lahore, 1961, p. 238.
- 60 *sic*
- 61 Muhammad Noman, (ed) *'Our Struggle, 1857 – 1947'*, Karachi, n.d, Jamil Ahmad, *'Hasrat Mohani'*, Dawn, 9 March 1952, Abida R Rizvi, *'Hasrat Mohani'*, *ibid*, 18 May 1958, Tahir Majid, *'Hasrat Mohani: A Dauntless Freedom Fighter'*, Dawn, 13 May 1967.
- 62 *IAR*, 1922, pp. 403 – 404.
- 63 Choudhry Rahmat Ali, *op. cit.*, p. 216.
- 64 No Author, *'Nuristan'* Sayyara Digest, January, 1966, pp. 65 – 68
- 65 The North-West Frontier Enquiry Committee, *'Report, Government of India'*, Delhi, 1924, pp. 122 – 123.
- 66 Muhammad Ali, *Presidential address of the Indian National Congress Session, 1923*
- 67 *Resolutions of the All India Muslim League from May 1924 to December 1936*, Delhi, n.d, Resolution No. 3, pp. 9 – 10
- 68 *IAR* 1923, Vol II, p. 478.
- 69 *Comrade*, 22. May, 1925.

Chapter -4-

Separatism and widening of the Hindu Muslim gap

By the time we reach 1925, the Hindu Muslim gap had become some thing of an impossible situation. We saw that it all had began with the assertion from the Muslim intellectuals that Muslims are a nation and they are separate from all others, and that they can not co exist with any one else, in the Indian context, the Hindus. This very premise of separatism continued from 1857 onwards unchanged, but the Muslim intellectuals had nothing more to add to this, except to repeat the same concepts in different languages through different intellectuals from time to time and place to place. Many Muslim intellectuals came and went by in time, and they all repeated the same ideas. A separate nation, the two nation theory and arrangement for a partition, all such things simply developed from the basic premises of separatism from the Muslim intellectuals.

On the part of the Hindus, things were not the same. Initially we see no Hindu at all reacting to the Muslim phenomenon of separatism seriously, though the Muslim attitude continued to be the same, albeit they had nothing new or more to add to it. It may be because that the Muslims were already asking for the ultimate and final thing right from the very beginning, and there was nothing more to it. If one looks at the Hindu situation, one can clearly see changes emerging among the Hindu intellectuals slowly, through, something akin to a process of evolution. The Hindus, who ignored the Muslim ideas of separatism initially, slowly started reacting to it in an evolutionary manner. They took time to look at the problem, they took time to react to the problem and they also took time to come out facing the problem. Even when the Hindus started reacting to the Muslim separatism, there continued to be many Hindus who chose not to attend to it or react to it and some others who chose to react and wanted to do so in a positive way that can bridge the beginning of the gap. Mahatma Gandhi was such a Hindu, who wanted to do everything which could bring about a Hindu Muslim unity. The Khilafat itself is a very good example.

With the phenomenon of Hindu intellectuals involving with the Muslim intellectuals in their separatist theories, the question of a Hindu Muslim unity was simply getting ruled out. The separatism initiated from the Muslim intellectuals has now to face the counter separatism from the Hindu intellectuals, which started getting stronger and vigorous slowly but steadily. From this time on, one can see two sets of Hindu intellectuals, the moderates, and the hard liners. People like Nathuram Vinayak Godse were not willing for a compromise on the Muslim separatist question. The moderates avoided drastic measures, but no one would compromise on the question of nationalism from the Hindu side except the Communists who were doing so in the light of their ideology of 'internationalism'. The Hindu hardliners wished to hold the Hindu Dharma and other Indian religions as a basis of Indian nationalism, while the moderates were trying to hold Indian culture as the basis of nationalism. This Indian culture, according to both hard liners and moderates is the same to every Indian, irrespective of their religion, faith system as well as religious rites. Only the Communists held the view that there is no single Indian culture, and there are as many cultures as possible in India, which can not be synthesised. The Communists also

held the view that Indian nation itself is not a single unit; it is simply an amalgamation of different units. In a word, all Indians except Muslims and the Communists belonged to the national mainstream and took Indian culture as the unifying aspect of Indian nation, either explicitly or implicitly. Thus, from now on one can experience Muslim intellectuals with their separatist ideology and their epistemology of differences, and the Hindu intellectuals with their ideology of oneness and the epistemology of co-existence and unity among variety. But our focus shall be more to the separatist ideologies from the Muslim intellectuals and not so much about the counter separatist ideologies of the Hindu intellectuals, since the counter separatist ideologies came simply as a reaction to separatism, which shall cease to be with changes in the manifestations of separatism as it had happened through time. The separatist ideologies had evolved into today's terrorism, to which what is now significant is ideologies in counter terrorism.

The right wing Hindu intellectuals went on with their programme of 'suddhi' and 'sangathan', of cleansing India of the Muslims. They wanted to reconvert the Muslims who were once Hindus and who were forced by the swords of the invaders to choose between Islam and death. Muslim intellectuals and leaders went on reiterating that the life with the Hindus is impossible. The Hindus now started seeing the Muslims as the stumbling block in attaining freedom from the colonial rule, since the Muslims chose not to cooperate with it. In 1926, Raj Kumar Ametti said that "all the Indian Muslims are converted to, Hinduism; we would see only Hindus around us. Nobody can, then, prevent us from getting freedom"(1). Pundit Madan Mohan Malavya was another of the right wing Hindus, who used to be much critical of the moderates who still believed that a Hindu Muslim unity is possible. Stung by his criticism, Pundit Motilal Nehru, the father of Jawaharlal Nehru made an announcement at Kanpur in September 1926, saying: "I can go one step further and say that even the Congress is a Hindu body. Some Muhammadans had certainly joined it in 1920 – 21; otherwise it had been all along a purely Hindu body from its very start"(2).

The Muslim leadership could only go on demanding all things which had already been spelt out for so many decades, with the same old logic that Muslims can not live with Hindus. But the Hindu intellectuals who had slowly been waking up came out with so many arguments favouring the Indian national unity. An editorial in a news paper argued: "If the foundation of swaraj is laid upon the unity of these two communities in India, the building thus raised can not last long. Its foundation will be shaky. This opinion is based on facts. The social boycott of Muslims for the sake of sangathan will not be harmful to Hindus. For the upkeep of a tree, it is necessary to chop off its branches and boughs and cut its superfluous portions. For a good work we have to make sacrifices, and so we should not mind a little loss"(3). The editorial further went on to discuss a 9 point programme of dos and don'ts to completely avoid Muslims in a Hindu's day to day life. Dr. BS Moonje spoke so: "From today it should be the duty of every Hindu to leave the Muslims in their condition, at the mercy of Englishmen, so that they might realise their folly, and in dejection should throw themselves at our feet, and should then help us in our struggle for swaraj without putting up any selfish demands. Such a unit would be more solid and durable"(4). The Hindu intellectuals were now at work, after several decades of Muslim propaganda. An editorial comment in the 'Arya Vir' of 25th June says: "Time is not far when this Islam shall be abolished for ever from India and any body, even Mahatma Gandhi, who will help directly or indirectly in the propagation or defence of Islam, shall be regarded as the enemy of this country and swaraj, and no true hearted

Hindu shall keep any relations with such persons Now we will practically show to Muhammadans and some of their swarajist friends that if they are desirous of seeing an atmosphere of peace and unity in India, it must be their first duty to drown this Islam in the Ganges for ever; Hindus can not tolerate Islam for long, because it has not only caused great harm to the Hindu nation, but has also prevented India from getting swaraj. So long as the present Islam is not reformed and it is an obstacle in the path of welfare and freedom of this country, Hindu Muslim unity is utterly impossible Time will come when this country will have Aryan rule once more. Then Islam will be properly reformed or people will be heard calling Abdul Rashid and Muhamad Amin by the name of Ram Sarup and Ram Das”(5)

By now the Hindus were becoming real counter separatists to the point of Hindu fanaticism, which ought to be a contradiction in terms. The Hindu philosophy is one that of all acceptance and tolerance, and also that of accepting multiple faith systems. In the Hindu Dharma itself, a variety of faiths and rituals do co exist, some times even to the point of contradicting one another, and yet, the Hindu Dharma continued to be the same through centuries. While in all other religions people do have separate place of worship for distinct sects, for the Hindus, a temple, no matter administered by whom, is for any Hindu and for all. So, it ought to be natural for a Hindu to accept and respect another faith, a phenomenon that had been demonstrated through time, history, and which, still goes on. Hence, Hindu fanaticism shall be a contradiction in terms; but here, four decades of Muslim fanaticism had patterned compulsions to such an extent, the Hindus had to react and react strongly for their own existence and survival. Four decades of Muslim fanaticism made Hindus unite as ‘Hindus’, a phenomenon which was un heard of (epistemologically there was no need to it). They had meetings, discussions, and public speeches. A speech of Moonje in April 1928 says: “As England belongs to Englishman, France to the French, and Germany to Germans, in the same way Hindustan belongs to the Hindus. Hindus want swaraj, but not at the cost of their religion. If the Muslamans want to co-operate with us, without making any demands for rights, the Hindus will also advance shoulder to shoulder with them; if not, the Hindus should be prepared to fight their way to freedom without the help of other communities, for the simple reason that Hindustan belongs to Hindus alone”(6).

The Hindu retaliation to Muslims separatism was strong and sometimes stinging, but it is noteworthy that no Hindu leaders ever called upon the Hindus to ‘hate’ Muslims. Fortunately, with all these adversaries, the hate philosophy had not crept into the Hindu philosophy as well as the Hindu minds. The Hindus were not so concerned with the Muslim call to hate Hindus as the Muslim non co-operation towards winning freedom for India. Even forty years of open Muslim campaigns against Hindus and Indian nation, there were no calls from any to hate or even oust Muslims from India. The Muslims had nothing new to add, they had already spelt out all their demands as well as feelings towards the Hindus, and as a result, nothing new used to come out from the Muslim intellectuals, and they simply “went on repeating a federal system in India would suit their needs”(7). The Muslims kept thinking in terms of separatism, there was only just one more thing to come out, a separate Muslim nation out of India. Many Muslim intellectuals had already thought in this line, but an organised demand was yet to come out in public.

During December 1928, the All India Khilafat Conference demanded a “federation of free and United States of India” with “fully autonomous” provinces, each unit having its own elected

governor and as well as assembly. These units will elect representatives to form Federal parliament, and whose jurisdiction determined by the constituent units. Further, it declares that "the Musalmans of India will not accept any constitution which would not be framed on the principles stated above"(8). Now there were many more Muslim intellectuals giving all kinds of interpretations to the Muslim problem, with their own different logics, but all with one conclusion that Muslims can not live with any others. Khwaja Hasan Nizami says: "Muslims are separate from Hindus; they can not unite with Hindus The Muslims are one united nation and they alone will be masters of India. They will never give up their individuality"(9). Dr. Shafat Ahmad Khan says that the Muslim community was united, compact and homogenous(10). Shafat is so convinced that the Muslims are a united and compact unit, a thought that can make any one laugh especially in the light of later developments and Muslim history. Such projections of Muslim unity, Muslim separate identity, Muslims as a nation, universal oneness of Islam, physical fighting spirit and sturdiness of Muslims and their special abilities to endure wars for longer time etc., kept getting repeated through the Muslim intellectuals on and on.

On the other hand, the Hindus also kept spreading ideas of the need of Hindu awakening of winning swaraj (home rule). An editorial of 'The Hindu' from Lahore is one example of this Hindu awakening. "Oh, young Hindu brethren of India, alas, where is the brave Pratap who was a terror to Emperor Akbar; where is that lion hearted Shivaji who paralysed Aurangzeb; where is that Banda Bairagi whose sword cut the Muhammadans to pieces? Alas! Alas! Where have they all gone, where are they hidden?"(11). Five days later, 'Milap' wrote, "The young Arya wants neither the rule of the English, nor of the Muslim, but only Ram Raj"(12). It is difficult for one to wonder how the Muslims must have taken the Hindu retaliation, for a Hindu reaction was a new phenomenon. Usually Hindus do not react to any insults on them, they overlook only. Normally, the Hindus are not an aggressive lot, and also not impulsive to jump into conclusions. It is apart from the characteristics of a Hindu to make aggressive and such statements against other religion or community. So though over for decades, when such Hindu reactions started coming, the Muslims must have definitely been puzzled. As we saw, the Muslims had demanded everything and said everything already; the only explicit demand was to come was Pakistan and nothing more. With the new Hindu stand, now the Muslims were turning to threatening, and bullying, that if they are not satisfied, there will not be any peace in the entire India. They started using this as a new weapon both against the British as well as Hindus.

By then every one knew how communal the Muslims are. Every one knew that the Muslims are the stumbling block to home rule, the swaraj. Mushir Hussain Kidwai denies the charges that the Muslims are too communal in their out look and they are opposed to democracy and the progress of India. He says that the Muslims would "go a step forward than their Hindu brethren" if the Muslims "are assured that the rule by non Muslims majority will not result ultimately in the expulsion of Muslims from India as it did from Spain". The Muslims are sure "that the majority, if let unchecked, would not hesitate to take wrong advantage of its ballot-box majority and power, and would trample down under its feet the tradition, the language, the culture of the majority"(13). The feeling of insecurity from the Muslims side had been always an internal Muslim problem, irrespective of external situations. The Muslims were made to feel the fear of their being in the minority by the intellectuals, and it had gone into their very psyche. It had become so that the

Muslims could only trust a Muslim majority, and another Mussalman. This suspicion and doubt to non Muslims had indeed become their curse, which had gone into the making of terrorism of present times. Who can be blamed for their psychic problems? And they go on planting bombs all over the world now a days, as a result of this insecurity and mistrust as they go one becoming more and more miserables and un acceptable to others. See how Muhammad Ali expresses this fear in the Round Table Conference of the 19th of November: "Let me assure every British man and woman who thinks of shaping our destinies that the only quarrel between the Hindu and the Muslim today is a quarrel that the Muslim is afraid of Hindu domination. I want to get rid of that fear"(14). Dr. Abdullah Al-Mamun Suhrawardy declared that "Muslims shall, on no account, tolerate the substitution of British rule by Brahmin rule or by the tyranny of the majority. Swaraj is a Hindu demand aimed at saving Hinduism from western influence"(15).

Sir Azizuddin Ahmad speaks even more clearly about the attitude of the Muslim intellectuals with the impact of the Hindu retaliation. He declares that if India gets swaraj or home rule, no constitution is going to work out even for six months if the Muslims are not given their "honour and power in it which is their due". The Muslims had ruled India for centuries, and they would never accept a Hindu majority rule. "There can be no compromise on the point". The Muslims demand and want "an equal partnership at the least". Any other solution to the Hindu Muslim problem other than equality with the Hindus "will end in total failure". It is the Muslim decision that "to the Hindus there can be no submission; and this fact must be realised by British constitution makers, or there can be no peace in India". In other words, "the Muslims refuse to accept a Hindu Raj: that is the long and short of it". He categorically threatens "the least attempt on the part of the Hindus to use their majority tyrannically would lead to civil war. The Muslims are of a fighting stock, and they will stand no nonsense"(16).

Here is a clear case of threatening and bullying. This phenomenon is a usual affair with the Muslims, who think and feel that they are fearsome fighters, so that all others are to be afraid of them. The barbaric ways of wars are still a matter of glory to them and killing a celebration. Many times the same ideas were repeated by many Muslim intellectuals, with such tones of bullying. In Iraq, when Saddam Hussain was in the regime, the way he had been speaking of his impending war with the Americans were sounding so fearsome, that every one thought it to be some thing terrible. Saddam said that "the mother of all battle had begun", when American bombers flew above Iraq. But then it all turned out to be nothing other than much sound and fury, the Americans swarm Iraq, and there was reaction from them. Saddam spoke a lot, but could do nothing. If one looks at the Muslim history, one can see the same things repeating on and on through out. Even when they know that they will be able to do nothing, there shall be no dearth of tall claims and big talks. This indeed is an impossible situation. The threat that there will not be peace in India if the Muslim demands are not met with and if the Muslims are not satisfied is aimed at the British primarily. This threat, they hoped, shall go a long way in getting the attention of the British, who were in rule. With the Hindus also it had the desired effect, many Hindus lost hope for a Hindu Muslim unity and many thought that even if the Muslim demands are met with, there shall be no peace, as their demands shall go on and on with new ideas coming up. As a result, some of the Hindu leaders even did not want the Muslims to live in India as a perennial source of social and other problems.

Lala Lajpat Rai, who used to be known as the 'Lion of Punjab' seemed to have been fed up with the Muslim attitude. He knew that the Muslim demand for separate Muslim electorates shall be completely inconsistent with Indian nationalism and the unity of India. He says that he can not understand how those who favoured it could ever be called nationalists, and he even mentioned the name of Jinnah. Nationalism and communal representation shall be mutually excluding, they both can not co exist. Some people argued that the communal representation shall only be a temporary affair, which can be made to vanish in the long run, when the Muslims become satisfied in time and when they shall cease to be afraid of the Hindu majority. Lala Lajpat Rai warned them that such a dream is an impossibility, and if at all communal representation is to be abolished, the only way shall be through nothing less than a civil war, which the Muslims already keep predicting. Should there be a civil war, it can only end with one community establishing supremacy over the other community, and here the Hindus identified a secret plot from the Muslims of getting some other Muslim nation like Afghanistan to invade and conquer India, and the Muslims would support the invaders. The idea of separate electorate, as the Hindus felt, is simply a technique to buy time for the Muslims to become formidable and strong, and when it is apt, they would invite other Muslim states to conquer India with their help. Thus they could re-establish the Muslim rule, and this time for the entire India. The colonial rulers were at ease. The Hindus and Muslims are quarrelling, and so long as they keep quarrelling, the question of swaraj or home rule shall remain unattainable. The Muslims prefer English to Hindu rule, and so long as the Muslims do not see any prospect for a separate Muslim state, they would support the continuation of colonial rule. Thus, for the Indians, when majority of them are struggling for freedom from the colonial rule, a good amount of them went all out in the support of the continuation of colonial rule. The British must have been too happy, and too comfortable, the Muslims had become happy instruments in their hands.

Lala Lajpat Rai realised the impossibility with the Muslims and found no way other than creating separate provinces for the Muslims; hopefully, they will stay in peace, and will not create problems for others. He made out a plan, and a scheme. "the Muslims will have four Muslim states: (1) the Pathan Province or the North West Frontier; (2) Western Punjab; (3) Sindh; and (4) Eastern Bengal. If there are compact Muslim communities in any other part of India, sufficiently large to form a province, they should be similarly constituted. But it should be distinctly understood that this is not a united India. It means a clear partition of India into Muslim India and non-Muslim India"(17). Pakistani historians like KK Aziz counts this suggestion as the first ever clear cut suggestion for partition and wonders that it came from a Hindu instead of a Muslim(18). But then, the Lala had spelt out in unconditional terms that with such Muslim states, India is never going to be a united India, and what all Indians wanted was nothing less than a united India. Perhaps the Lala became exasperated with the Muslim demands, and realised that there is no other way with this lot.

The Muhammadan Anglo Oriental College at Aligarh had already been a hot seat of Muslims separatism and fanaticism. Many British who had been in association with MAO College were supporters of this; to keep the Hindus and Muslims at swords drawn, for the sake of continuation of the British rule. When the MAO College was restructured into a University under the name of the Aligarh Muslim University, it was giving further sanctity to such separatisms and

fundamentalisms. The University had produced many varieties of separatism, which went into the making of many kinds of terrorism in modern times. In 1925, Dr. Syed Zafar Hasan, the head of the Department of Philosophy and the Pro Vice-Chancellor of AMU formed a team to prepare a scheme of partition from India. The other significant members of the team were Dr. Burhan Ahmad Faruqi, Dr. Afzal Qadri, Dr. MM Ahmad, Raghbir Ahsan and Sayyid Amiruddin Kidwai, who worked as secretary to the group. This group had done an excellent academic work, first they tried to understand the Hindu Muslim problem and then they tried to find solutions to it.

They started with the Hindi Urdu controversy first. Apparently the Hindu Muslim problems were centring around cow killing, and this team found that it is much deeper than that. As I had mentioned before, the Muslims wanted Urdu while the Hindus wanted Hindi. Interestingly, both Urdu and Hindi are one and the same language with some small variations, that Urdu shall have many Persian words in it, and Hindi Sanskrit; which is not a significant difference. Both Urdu and Hindi can be seen using words from Sanskrit and Persian crisscrossing as well. The fundamental difference came from writing script, Muslims wanted Persian script, while the Hindus wanted Devanagari. This really constituted the Urdu Hindi controversy. The second point the group highlighted was about equal share for Hindus and Muslims in public services. The finding that Muslims are not represented in public services according to their numbers, is rather funny. They should also have looked at the literacy rate among the Muslims when comparing the employment rate with the Hindus. Then they insisted on separate representation through separate electorates, which as Lala Lajpat Rai pointed out can not make a united India. Then they spoke about democracy, as not the proper system of government for Indian conditions since the majority are still Hinds in spite of centuries of Muslim rule. Democracy shall only make it a Hindu rule. Further they studied about the religious rites of the Hindus and concluded that, they contradict one another. This is only natural, they are unable to see the underlying epistemology of one-ness among the apparently contradicting rites. They can perceive differences only.

Then they offered suggestions for a Hindu Muslim unity. The possibility of co existence depends on re arranging India on the basis of a new theory of nationality. Muslims should be given the NWFP, Punjab, Sindh and Bengal. Rules should be framed to protect the minorities' freedom and their right for public employment. Religious minorities should be given some special centres exclusively for them. Amritsar and Ludhiana for the Sikhs, and Sialkot for the Christians. The united province which is the cultural centre of the Muslims, must be earmarked for the Muslims. Transfer of population must be facilitated. Muslims must migrate to Muslim areas and the others should vacate from there(19). The group called this as the Aligarh scheme, and dates it to 1925. This Aligarh scheme of 1925, which is lesser known does not make the division of India an explicit one, and not many people had noticed it. But one can take this 1925 scheme as a forerunner of the much discussed 1939 scheme, though the 1939 scheme does not even mention this 1925 scheme. However, the intellectuals were at work though they had not concretised their vision of a Pakistan which could get popular Muslim support.

Nawab Sayyid Sardar Ali Khan

In 1928, a book was published in London named 'The Indian Muslims'. The writer disguised himself as an 'Indian Mohammadan', and the publishers kept the secret as to who the author could be. The same author had already written another book 'British India from Queen Elizabeth to Lord Reading'. For many years the identity of this 'Indian Mohammadan' had been kept secret, and it was only much later that people came to know who this Indian Mohammadan is. It was Nawab Sayyid Sardar Ali Khan of Hyderabad in Deccan, the south of India. As usual, 'The Indian Muhammadan' was also haunted by the phantom of the Muslim fear of an impending Hindu domination and insecurity of Muslims. Though by 1928, thoughts towards a physical separation of Hindus and Muslims had become a normal course in the Hindu Muslim problems, the Nawab's book do not make such suggestions. This has its own history, and cultural moorings. The south of India was not so much pounded under the Muslim rule as it was in north, where almost all ancient Hindu temples, fortresses, and even townships were spuriously transformed into Muslim creations. Temples were restructured and converted into mosques where ever they could, and fortresses were reconstructed in the Muslim patters for the future short sighted historians to believe that they were built by the Muslim kings. Much devastation had been done in the north, but in the south, this was different. First of all, the south was not under the rule of the Muslims much. Only few Muslim rulers were there, and they were surrounded by powerful Hindu kings. Temples and fortresses were not occupied on the scale as it had happened in the north. Most of all, the Hindus and Muslims lived in a better atmosphere of togetherness, and the activities of Muslim intellectuals were much less in these areas as well. The most fundamentalist among the Muslim rulers were the Nawabs of Hyderabad, and the most fundamentalists of Muslims in the south were the Hyderabadis. Yet, they did not speculate of a Muslim separate state. The Nawab says:

"..... and no doubt if India ever comes again to be subdivided, as was her usual lot before the Mughal arrived, they (Muslims) will be entitled to obtain there share in a general partition. But it would not be any India that preserved its unity. In default of British control, resigned in weariness or disgust, that unity could only be revived and sustained by the Muslims recruited as they would be their kinsmen and co religionists from the regions beyond the North West Frontier. It is the appreciation of these facts, which do not seem to be understood by English politicians, and the consciousness of their own worth and dignity that makes the Muslim of India so tenacious of their rights, so resentful of their attempted infraction by races for whom, in the historical sense, they can only feel contempt and derision. To tell them that the Hindus are to be the future masters of India inspires them with wonder as to the mental calibre of the persons who can credit such fairy tales. Not only are the Muslims fully conscious of their innate power, but the Hindus have not been so completely imbued with the indulgence of their newly developed megalomania as to be unaware of it, or to persuade themselves that a purely numerically total has ever sufficed to support a sway. If so, lions would have no chance among the sheep. It is the sense of this inferiority – for it is nothing else – that makes the Hindus so clamorous and energetic in urging the British public, and the leaders of that public, to suppress and humiliate the Muslims and to regard themselves as the sole spokesmen of India Within the frontiers of India live two nations, the Muslims and the Hindus, which entertain for each other the same feelings as do, for instance, French and Germans, and who differ from one another more than profoundly than any two nations in Europe"(20).

The Nawab brings out some striking features of the Muslim intellectuals. Indeed these intellectuals were the best lot among the Muslims in the entire world then. And they were proud, and they believed that India is theirs. Their premises are these: firstly, the Indian Muslims had made their impact and contributions in a definite manner during few centuries. The Muslims had been ruling a good chunk of India. The Indian Muslims had made definite contributions to literature, art and music, and they did erect a culture of their own. As a matter of fact, they do have a right to be proud of these things, and a right to be proud of being Musalmans (they should have added, 'Indian' Mussalmans). Another thing which the Indian Muslims speak much is about their physical vigour as compared to the Hindus and their claim that they are a fighting lot. They are fighters no doubt, but they are not the only fighters within India. Truly, the Hindus are not a fighting lot essentially, and they had never gone out of India to invade other countries. The Hindus do not have a culture and practice of invading other territories and continuously waging wars. The Hindu rulers were literate, and great supporters of art music and literature, and they themselves were great exponents. But then, when it came to resisting and fighting, they did put up great fights, and are capable of physical vigour and valour, but certainly not mercilessness. It is here that one needs to make some analysis into the Muslims pride and claims.

None of these categories pertaining to the Muslim pride has been brought to India by any Muslim invaders. Nor is it originating from their religious text or places where the Muslims are in majority. All the categories within the Muslim pride are originated in India, and flourished in India. Nothing was brought from any where. Then, how Islam alone can claim pride in them? It is striking that none of the Muslim intellectual ever even made a passing remarks or mention about the Vedic tradition, the Indian Philosophical tradition, epistemology and other Indian knowledge. They all knew that there is an already well established knowledge system in India along with all other institutions of society, but they ignore them. India already had existing literature, art, music, philosophy and culture, apart from various other scientific knowledge. And undoubtedly, there is no denying that it all belong to the Hindus, and this very land called India. The Nawab calls Hindus sheep and Muslims lions. What make the Muslims lions and Hindus sheep? Abilities to brutalities and wars? If the criteria are intellectual abilities, then the Muslims are indeed a poor lot in front of the Hindus. If it is culture, then the Muslims are far flung when compared with the Hindus. Even in battle, of which they keep talking much, except being brutal and merciless, the Hindus are no way behind, a fact testified by Alexander himself, son of Phillip of Macedonia, much before there were any Muslim invasion.

Coming to the point; the Indian Muslims did not bring any culture and knowledge with them when they came in as invaders. What ever the Indian Muslims are proud of, are nothing other than a product of this land, this culture, this tradition and this existing knowledge system. On the first place, all Indian Muslims are not those who came from far flung lands, though most of them wish to think so. Majority of Indian Muslims are Indians, converted mostly by the swords of Muslim invaders. These converted Muslims, who are the vast majority, naturally are a part and parcel of Indian culture from day one. Those Muslims, who came from other lands, settled in India and became Indians, owned up Indian culture, and made a distinct stream within Indian culture, which later the Muslims went about treating as exclusive to Muslims. In short, what ever the Muslims

may claim, they all are essentially Indian on a final analysis, and Islam per say, has nothing whatsoever to do with it.

This phenomenon with the Muslims has the 'Aryan Race Theory' as its corollary. The Aryan race theory says that Aryans are a race, who came to India and created Indian civilisation. This of course was a cooked up theory as it became proved later. But given the theory, from where did they come? Which language they spoke? Did they 'create' Indian civilisation only after coming here in India? If they came from somewhere else, there must be their kinsmen, some of them at least, living elsewhere, and why there is not even a trace of any civilisation among the supposed kinsmen? Above all, if India was not civilised before the Aryans, then, why India? Why couldn't the so called Aryans find some other easy places? Did they move in with their entire lot just to create a civilisation only at the Saraswati basin? Yet it still is soothing to some, to think of as the inheritors a great civilisation and they may go on with it.

The story of the Muslims is also the same. When Muslims found themselves in India with many Indians who were made Muslims, an aculturation process took place. Amidst an existing culture, it is impossible to make an island and live, and the Muslims who came from outside also became Indians along with the converted Indian Muslims. And thus, the Muslim culture in essence becomes Indian culture and nothing less, nothing more. If the Muslim intellectuals wanted to pride, it ought to have been exclusively Muslim, which indeed is not the case here. All what the Muslims think as theirs are Indian only, except the religion of Islam, and the religion of Islam has nothing to do with the so called pride of the Indian Muslims. This is the fundamental mistake done by the Muslim intellectuals, and the Nawab had been simply repeating them. It is this very culture that had been keeping India together in spite of many political divisions, which also they fail to comprehend. This of course had been proved in later period of time. The much celebrated NWFP, is now reduced to a society with turmoil and peacelessness. The Much celebrated Afghanistan had gone to the barbaric ways, through the contribution of Islam. Pakistan is edging towards barbaric ways, again through the contribution of Islam. Of course, by Islam, I mean the autochthons of Islam. In short, the Indian Muslim intellectuals were hunting the phantom, and chasing a mirage in terms of a separate Muslim identity and further, Muslim nation. They really did miss the bus through such activities, and went out from India, the only place where they could have been accepted in society and lived in peace, should they ever wanted to live in peace.

So far, we had been seeing the views and interpretations of the intellectuals alone. All these ideas were speculative as in the case of the western Philosophical tradition, unlike the Indian Philosophical tradition which they say is experiential as against speculative. The thoughts and expressions of the Muslims were speculative, depending on individual thinkers. But now, in 1928, some thing comes in the form a news paper report, by a freelance reporter called JM Ewart who was stationed in India and used to write as a freelancer. The Simon Commission was already appointed for constitutional reforms, and their impact in India was significant, actually making both Hindus and Muslims unhappy at the same time. Ewart sends in an article to the times for publication, concerning the general situations in India and specially that of the Punjab with the background of the Simon Commission. Ewart is not mentioning his name; the 'report' was under the name of 'a correspondent from India'. It runs thus: "Through out not only the Punjab, but also the valley of the Indus and its tributaries there is a practical vision of a constructive future, based

on history. This is the vision of effective Muslim rule. From Sind to Lahore and Peshawar this vision is near and clear; in the south it is an abstraction The Muslims – urban and rural – are practically solid in the intention to co operate with the Royal commission for the presentation of their claims for a dominant position in the Punjab proper, the extension of representative institutions to the NWFP and Baluchistan, and the separation of Sind from Bombay. These claims are obviously controversial even in matters of comparative detail, but the motive behind them is of world significance Once the claims put forward are implemented there would come a move for augmentation of the present Delhi enclave to a major administration, by transferring to it the predominantly Hind districts of the Eastern Punjab which adjoin it. From the point of view of a common culture and administrative convenience such a step would find many supporters, and it is thoroughly practicable. We should then have a solid Muslim 'bloc' from the Peshawar valley to the mouths of the Indus. Its supporters hold that this policy is practicable, and that it not only secures the interests of the Muslim majority in the area immediately affected but is the best – in fact the only – constructive plan for guaranteeing safe development to an independent Hindustan established as they wish to be, the Muslims of the North would view with comparative unconcern the efforts of Hindustan to develop self-government on lines compatible with Brahmanism. Their position of strategical predominance would enable them to assure fair treatment to the minorities of their own religion in the other provinces It is not to be supposed that things will work out immediately just as the Muslim leaders would wish. It does not seem logical, however, or compatible with our avowed intentions towards India to discountenance out of hand a plan which is constructive and contains many elements of a practicable structure”(21).

It had always been the case with the Muslims that religion is the only criterion for togetherness. Their history was only to witness the infightings within Islam, under the names of different sects of Muhammadans, and different Muhammadans speaking different languages as well as different Muhammadans belonging to different geographical spaces. But for now, the Islamic state, a Dar-ul-Islam remained a haven as well as heaven with no problems whatsoever, and absolute peace. In 1928, the Muslims wanted an effective Muslim rule in areas where they are sizable in numbers. The hopes here were about one solid Muslim country from Peshawar to Karachi. KK Aziz says that “it would be a fortress as well as a haven of peace. Not only would the Muslims thus find themselves again and live a life of their own, but this would also leave the Hindus free to pursue their ideals in their own way without the political necessity of dragging the unwilling Muslims in their wake. The strength and the internal coherence of the Muslim 'bloc' would be a guarantee that the Muslims left behind in Hindudom were not ill treated. The prospects for achieving this end were not brilliant; but neither were they dark and remote. Things were moving fast – how fast is only now clear in perspective – faster than man had hoped, even faster than their thoughts. They were to gather even greater speed as some politicians made mistakes and others gained by them, as the contradictions of British policy became apparent, as the comforting prospect for a united India receded into oblivion as it had always receded during its long history, as the stirrings of the Muslim soul reached that highest note where music ends with a crashing throb and leaves the heart ready to achieve the impossible, and as a leader of iron resolution emerged to lead his flock to the summit of freedom”(22).

The language of Aziz becomes so rhetoric, which is actually unbecoming for a historian; and he is very emotional here. Aziz, the Pakistani historian is very positive that in the Muslim 'bloc' the Muslims are going to live in peace and harmony, and at the same time not very sure that the Hindus will be able to do so after the separation. The solidarity and togetherness of the Muslim nation adjacent to India is also seen as a guarantee for the welfare of the left over Muslims in India, for fear of the anger from the Muslim nation which is coherent and strong in terms of progress and internal strength. Such were the beliefs of Muslim intellectuals even after the formation of Pakistan, and they also were too hopeful of conquering India some time in future, as it still remained at the back of their minds that India belongs to the Muslims, no matter how irrational these thoughts may be in reality. The words of Aziz amply show how hopeful and dreamy the Muslim intellectuals used to be, and one can imagine the kinds of thoughts they were propagating among the common Muslims.

And in reality, these dreams did not even remain in dream form for long, leave alone them becoming real. Aziz speaks about a leader with iron resolution, which is undoubtedly Jinnah, and as a matter of fact, Jinnah himself was not very sure of the future of Pakistan, which was an assemblage right from day one. Sri Prakasa, India's first high commissioner to Pakistan makes some revealing remarks about a post divided and new Pakistan. He says that he was authoritatively informed at Karachi that "the greatest shock of Jinnah's life was the conceding and establishment of Pakistan. He really never wanted it; and when it had come he did not know what to do with it. He found almost impossible to manage it"(23). Actually, Jinnah was using the Pakistan demand only as a pressure tactic to wring our maximum benefits for Muslims, and never thought that Pakistan would become a reality. Penderel Moon writes that "privately Jinnah told one or two people in Lahore that his resolution (for partition) was a tactical move"(24). So much for the iron man of KK Aziz. And what happened to Pakistan after 1947 is well spelt out by Leonard Mosley, "Pakistan turned into a Balkan state riddled with corruption and intrigue"(25). Ajithkumar says: "There has never been a country in history like Pakistan, whose domestic life has been as splintered as its territorial shape, and whose foreign policies were designed to suit its internal problems. Judged by any standard of territorial demarcation, Pakistan was undoubtedly a unique creation! This satirical comment made by a modern Indian writer does not appear baseless while viewed against the backdrop of Pakistan's political and geographical settings. Pakistan does not, writes Keith Callard, 'possesses a history of national unity, it has no common language nor a uniform culture, and it is neither a geographical nor an economical unit'(26).

The hopes and beliefs of the Muslim intellectuals became thus a total fiasco. The hope and belief that they had been carrying and propagating that religion is 'the' unifying factor, and once the Muslims are removed from the Hindu contiguity there could be haven had simply been foolish, which they are yet to realise in spite of these historical developments post 1947. The Muslim intellectuals were miserably wrong right from 1857 onwards and most of them did not live to realise their mistakes. Among their fallacious premises, two become very important. One, their criteria for unity had been religion instead of either culture or a culture based civilisation, both of which, actually belong to the Hindus. Two, they failed to ever realise that what ever the Indian Muslims are, are due to their intermingling with the Hindus and on the basis of Indian culture,

which essentially is Vedic, and Hindu, if one may say so. But then, the Muslim blunter had been on, and is actually still going on!

At this point of time, 1928, such things are just futuristic, and the golden dream of Pakistan is still luring and beautiful. Mawlana Ashraf Ali Thanawi, is yet another Muslim intellectual to suggest a separation of Muslim state in 1928((27). The intellectuals and the leaders kept dreaming about a golden Age for the Muslims, and kept propagating that among the common and innocent Muslims. (eventually to make them modern terrorists).

Many Muslim intellectuals who were initially not so ardent supporters of separatism had changed their opinions subsequently. This was primarily due to the changes in general feeling and relations between both Hindus and Muslims. The hard liners eventually found their influences among the moderates also. What could have been an epistemological solution had now become impossible, the intellectuals simply dreamt of a Dar-ul-Islam to make a mess of everything eventually. The Aga Khan also makes drastic changes in his views in ten years of time, from that of 1918 to what is seen in 1928. The 1918 sketch of Aga Khan was a huge south Asian federation with India at its heart. He was not so communal at this point, though a separatist. Then a sudden out burst from Aga Khan was initiated with the publication of the Nehru report. The constitution had rejected the Muslim demand for a federal system as the Muslims conceived, and with this immediate cause, all the remote causes within Aga Khan surfaced to actually want of a separate Muslim state.

Aga Khan takes pre 1914 Bavaria as his model to work out an arrangement for future India. "Each Indian province must enjoy to the full the freedom and independence" like that of old Bavaria. The present Indian provinces ought to be converted to "free states ultimately held together by the bond of monarchy, represented by the present British sovereign and his heirs". To this end, the existing provinces ought to be completely re casted and reframed, which had to be done on new principles. "Each free state should be based, not on consideration of size, but on those of religion, nationality, race, and language – plus history" and " the Muslim provinces of the North and West would probably coalesce and make one important free state". Here he is very clear that these free states are not going to make an Indian federation as it has been thought of so far. Just see his words: "The free states would not be mere provinces with legislatures and executives liable to be overruled by a Central Government in which the Hindus would have a permanent majority. They would be secured from all kinds of interference, except in matters in which they would be freely associated with the other states"(28). Interestingly, Aga Khan makes a radical suggestion. He goes beyond the then idea of a federal India to dream in terms of a near totally free states, who are loosely connected at will with one another. This indeed is an indirect suggestion for a total separate state for Muslims alone. Once the free states were created and put to work, the Muslim provinces in the North west would merge with other Muslim states to make a larger Muslim state, and this was Aga Khan's dream, which had even gone much beyond the dream Iqbal had foreseen in 1930.

FK Khan Durrani

Fazal Karim Khan Durrani used to edit a journal known as 'The Muslim India' from Lahore in the twenties. Later, in the thirties, he issued another weekly called 'The Truth' from 66, Railway Road Lahore. He published two books, one, 'The Future of Islam in India' at Lahore in 1929, and another 'The Meaning of Pakistan' also from Lahore in 1944. Still, the general Muslim demand was for a federation in India, but many like Aga Khan wanted more than mere federation and something akin to complete freedom, or independent nation. Durrani was not to want a federation; he wanted a Muslim state itself. He wanted to re-establish the 'one time glory' of the Muslim rule in India and India for the Muslims exclusively. His first premise goes as "Hindu-Muslim unity is impossible"(29). Durrani argues that Islam must once again conquer India and rule, meaning that the Hindus must be conquered and subjugated once again as it was done by the Muslim rulers in the past. "so long as the Hindus and Muslims keep their separate identities, they can not unite. The only solution of India's problem is that one of them must go. Either Islam must re-conquer Hindustan and with greater thoroughness than it did before, or Hinduism must wipe Islam off India's surface. There is no other solution possible"(30). He rightly argues that an adjustment is not possible with the Muslims, and the Hindu Muslim problem can not be solved through pacts and talks. "No state has ever in the history of the world come into being through pacts. States are based upon power, not upon pacts. The creation of a state by Hindu Muslim unity would be a wholly new experiment in the history of the world, which will call for its success the highest morals on both sides. These do not exist and failure of the experiment is a foregone conclusion"(31). He adds: "The true solution of the communal problem lies in the elimination of one of the two contesting elements. Before independence can be achieved, one community must wipe out the other or reduce it to such helplessness that it ceases for ever to count as a factor"(32). Obviously, Durrani wants Hindus to be either entirely eliminated from India or at least reduced to such a position that they will totally be insignificant. This indeed was the conditions of the Hindus under the so called glorious rule of the Muslims, where at some point all non Muslims were to pay a religious tax for living in a Muslim state, the name of which was 'Jazia'. As a matter of fact, the Hindus were insignificant to the Muslims when they were in the rule, ruling the land of Hindus and making them insignificant for the Muslim ways. The call here is to repeat the same situation, of killing or ousting all Hindus possible, and if there shall be some who still survive, to enslave them under the Muslim yoke. Interestingly, the Muslims always wanted India, but only without the Hindus! Even now, this remains as a permanent attitude of the Pakistan, who wish to make India their part, but without the Hindus. They still seem to think and feel that they are very great fighters, which did not, how ever, go t demonstrated in few wars India had with Pakistan.

Durrani goes on: "For years and years I had been cherishing a dream and the time has come that I should put it before my brethren. It is the dream of a MUSLIM INDIA. I have never been a believer in Hindu Muslim unity the events that have happened in India during the last ten years have made it plain for all who have eyes to see that the dream of a MUSIM INDIA is the only alternative that has been left to the Muslims of this country"((33). Durrani speaks of the development in India for the last ten years, which implies from somewhere in 1919. As we saw, the Hindu retaliation was slowly getting shaped up in recent years. As a matter of fact, the Muslim separatism originated way before, in the 1850s itself, which we had mentioned in the beginning itself. Some sixty years of Muslim separatism, fundamentalism, and anti Hindu feelings, and as it is the case with the Hindus, they took their time to realise these and to react. Hindus gave the

Muslims lots and lots of patience, opportunities and time to get corrected, but they went on further only. The Hindu reaction comes after much desperation, but when it came, again as usual with the Hindus, it comes with force. Durrani is referring to these Hindu reactions, but is conveniently neglecting that it is all caused by the Muslims and continuously for sixty or more years. What ever may the Muslim intellectuals be saying, their ultimate objectives had been the same, which is not concealed any more, that, they want India for themselves without all non Muslims, Hindus in particular since they are in the majority. No one speaks of the Sikhs which is indeed strange, a community which is bent upon resisting the Muslim invasion! Unfortunately for the dream of Durrani, even if he gets all the Hindus off India, the Sikhs alone are more than sufficient to cleanse India of the negativists, which is not now realised by Durrani and other Muslim intellectuals.

See how fanatic he becomes towards the conclusion of his book: "The true solution of India's problem is elimination of one of the two elements. Either the Muslims should commit suicide and remove themselves from the stage (or grow tufts of hair on their heads and become Hindus, which means the same thing) or assert themselves like Muslims and make a bid for the empire of India. There is no other alternative"(34). The times where such, Muslim fanaticism was getting counter poised with Hindu fanaticism, and a name that must be remembered here is that of the Lala Har Dayal of Punjab apart from many activists of the Hindu Maha Sabha. The Hindu Maha Sabha came out with the ideals that faith apart, all Indians are Hindus culturally, and therefore, must get themselves cleansed through the process of 'Suddhi'. Evidently, such things do not make any sense to the Muslim intellectuals, who see Islam as impeccable and highest. By now, the Hindus were also demanding a Hindu Raj, or Ram Raj, as the Gandhi himself had spoke of often. In either case, both meant Indian culture and values, not merely the Hindu faith system, which was never accepted by the Muslim leaders.

Durrani's was also aware of the difficulties within his dream of making India a Muslim nation. Perhaps all Muslims intellectuals were aware of this. On the one hand it was a beautiful dream for the Muslims to dream of a Muslim India. But how is this to be possible? Durrani thought of annihilating all non Muslims, which can only be another dream. Now the only possibility that remain is to get a Muslim state and move all Muslims of other places there. Muslims are spread all over India, which is a vast land. Is it possible to move all Muslims to an earmarked exclusive Muslim place? Definitely, they must have thought of many options. But what the Muslim intellectuals did not think of, and could not visualise is the inherent nature of infighting as well as differences among the Muslims themselves. Just take the case of Durrani himself. Durrani could not gather many followers, in spite of his journals, books and extremist Muslim fundamentalism, his association with Iqbal and many such leaders etc., just because of one reason, that Durrani belonged to the Ahammadiyya Muslim sect. 'General' Muslims do not accept the Ahammadiyyas as Muslims at all, they are outside the so called frame of Islam according to some. Today, in Pakistan which is a Muslim nation, Ahammadiyyas are not counted as Muslims at all! Muslim intellectuals could not foresee the possibilities of internal differences within the religion of Islam itself, and could not realise that this very 'too much' of a religion is going to destroy them in future. Eventually, these had shaped into contemporary terrorism, which has its deep roots into these histories, without which, any understanding of terrorism anywhere is bound to be partial as well as shaky. In a way, one of the strong ingredients to Jihadi Terrorism comes from within Islam itself,

which is their internal, and intra religious differences plus linguistic as well as territorial differences. Differences here are bound to be; as with any one who bases oneself on an epistemology of difference, it becomes a natural phenomenon. Then the repetition of the same mistakes of blaming 'others' for their internal differences which had gone in the increase from the times we are discussing now; and had turned into hate philosophy to others, like the Americans, Israelites etc. Scrupulously viewing, it reveals itself that all phenomena concerned with contemporary terrorism is essentially rooted in two things, one, hate philosophy and two, epistemology of difference. And both these are not new; they began way back in India, from the late 1850s.

The extremist views of Durrani shall not be astounding to people of today, as we are familiar with more extreme views. One simple example is from that of the Taliban, and to pick an instance, their 'official' destruction of the Bahmian Buddhas. Once upon a time, the very ancestors of the same Afghanis erected those huge statues of the Buddha, which had become a wonder to modern world. Considerable must have been that civilisation which created them. With Islam coming in, the Afghanis had made a unique 'U' turn in time to go back to the old days of the Arabian deserts. The Taliban, had 'officially' destroyed those statues naming them as 'un Islamic'. India had definite relations with Afghanistan from times immemorial. According to the epic of 'Mahabharata', the wife of the Delhi King 'Dhritarashtra' comes from 'Gandhara' in Afghanistan, which is today's Kandahar. Her brother, 'Sakuni' by name, who is very famous in the epic for his cunning and shrewdness, lived the rest of his life after his sister's wedding in Delhi. This one time glorious civilisation had now gone to the desert ways, infighting among the same people, and the external nation of America had to post their soldiers for peace keeping there: for the safety of other nations. This is the kind of 'U' turn civilisations take with such kind of rigidity and fundamentalism, in this case, with Islam. Pakistan is also another emerging example to this; they had become 'Islamic Republic' only recently, but a comparison with Pakistan and India shall indeed be revealing even now, though they both are the same people with the same history. One can only account for this 'U' turn in Pakistan for Islam, which is the one and only difference they have with India.

Mawlana Murtaza Ahmad Maikash was yet another Muslim intellectual of the late 1920s. There appeared a series of four articles by him in the 'Inquilab', an Urdu daily news paper from Lahore during December 1928. He was demanding for a separate home land for the Muslims instead of a federal system in India. Maikash "stated in very clear cut-terms that the solution of (the) Hindu Muslim problem lay in the establishment of a Muslim national homeland consisting of (the) Punjab, Sind, Baluchistan and the NWFP"(35). If one recalls, there used to be Muslim separatist statements, writings and speeches right from the times of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan and others, say from the 1857s onwards. There used to be no reaction or response from any Hindu writer or intellectual strongly opposing or even reacting to these, as they chose to 'over look' these as exceptions in the typical Hindu tolerance. But now, in 1928, things have drastically changed. The articles of Maikash brought immediate and very strong reactions from the Hindu intellectuals, that appeared in another news paper from Lahore called 'Partap'. The reply was so strongly worded and logical, that Maikash replies it saying that the Muslims shall make separate state "on the basis of the internationally recognised principle of the right to self-determination..."(36). whatever might have been the logic the Hindus produced, Maikash was adamant in finding a Muslim land at least in the Muslim majority areas, be it or not the 'international right to self-determination'!

Some thing is interesting at this point. Most of these claims to separate Muslim state came from individual intellectuals, and not from any Muslim Politicians. They were actually waiting, fully wanting a separate Muslim state and at the same time not wanting to bell the cat. The question before them was, who will start it? What if it gets not accepted by the people? There still remained many Muslims who were hopeful of a Hindu Muslim unity. This was indeed prudence on the part of the politicians, if the demand of a separate Muslim land is not received well, then the entire blame may be put on one or few individuals. This risk, at this time, no one was willing to take, no one was willing to lead the ideas into a partition of India. Thus the ideas of a separate land remained in the activities of the individual Muslim intellectuals only. As it is always the case, no politician usually risks his 'career' through both ideology and emotions.

Perhaps the first ice breaking by any politician comes in the form of a dissent note to the minutes of the Report of Indian Central Committee that had been appointed to work with the Simon Commission. Dr. Abdullah Al-Mamun Suhrawardy from Bengal and Nawab Sir Zulfiqar Ali Khan from Punjab wrote this dissent: "If Sind, Punjab, Bengal, NWFP, and Baluchistan had their own governments, it will create a balance of power in India which is highly desirable"(37). This goes against the hitherto Muslim politician's demand of a federal system, which did not envisage the creation of provinces on the basis of religion. The federal system was to create provinces according to administrative convenience, and not on explicitly religious line. The Muslim hope was that they will have two provinces that cannot be anything but Muslim majority provinces like the NWFP and parts of Punjab. Undoubtedly at the back of their minds all Muslim politicians had this idea of Consolidated and strong Muslim provinces, but they were not explicit for the sake of prudence from politics. These two politicians had actually belled the cat, though implicitly, by making their demand for a 'balance of power'. Now it had only to materialise in concrete terms, though it still is a long way to partition.

Towards the end of 1929, the then Vice Chancellor of the Aligarh Muslim University, Sir Ross Masud, expressed certain opinions on the Hindu Muslim problem in his private talk with the Governor of the United Provinces. This got reported to the Governor's communication to the Viceroy, which runs in the following manner: "The differences of the Muslims with the Hindus are deep-seated, and the Muslims feel that they would be swamped in a self governing India. Their minds are turning more and more to the idea of a federation between modernized Afghanistan with Persia in the background and with allies in the frontier independent territories. The Punjab Muslims have long been talking among themselves of a union of the northern Punjab, Sind, Baluchistan and Afghanistan. A generation ago, a union with Afghanistan would have been regarded with horror, for the Pathan was not a very popular person in the northern India; but the memory of his raids is dying out; and at present, at all events, it seems preferable to many of them to run the risk of engaging him as an ally rather than to accept the certainty of domination by a Hinduised Central Government"(38). One could see the desperation among the Muslims here and at the same time their utter fanaticism. Normally, the Pathans were not accepted much by the other Muslims, but here we find them thinking of uniting with the Pathans. The desperation of Muslims comes from the fact that in spite of a long rule in India they could not make India a Muslim majority nation as they could do the world over. Still, India is not a Muslim majority nation, but the Muslims were desperate to be rulers of India. They think and feel that they could have continued to be

ruling India had the British not come. Now, there is all possibility of British giving home rule to India or leaving India for ever in time to come, but then it is going to be the majority rule, which is certainly not Muslim rule.

Afghanistan had been a Muslim nation for long, and whatever might be the Pathan, they are still Muslims as against the Hindus. This made many Muslims dream of an Afghan invasion to India in which they could support them. When nothing seems possible, if the Muslims could unite with Afghanistan and such other Muslim states, that seemed the only possibility to juxtapose the Hindu majority in India. Hence, many Muslim intellectuals did cherish the idea of a Pathan friendship, and now, a union. The Vice Chancellor's concepts were right, most likely he was only giving out his gathered and valid information to the Governor, which in turn got transmitted to the viceroy. And, obviously, so much about the Indian National Congress, and Indian nationalism.

Sir Zulfiqar Ali Khan

Then comes the first explicit demand for a separate Muslim nation that completely detaches from India to save the Muslims from the 'impending slavery' of the Hindus by Sir Zulfiqar Ali Khan from a public platform on the very last day of 1929, the 31st of December. This was the same Nawab who signed dissent in the minutes along with Suhrawardy. Nawab Khan of Malerkotla, Punjab held many important offices in public affairs. He was an important personality in the All India Muslim League, member of the Muslim conference, and a member of the Khilafat conference. He was also a member of the Council of State, the upper chamber of the Indian central legislature, member of Indian legislative assembly from 1921 to 1926, member in the lower house from 1926 till his death in 1933, and the president of the central Muslim party in the legislative assembly for long time. In 1930 he was in the Indian delegation to the league of nations and in 1931, he was nominated to the Indian franchises committee. Highly educated, established scholar, owned a huge private library as well as author of several books including two biographies, one of Maharaja Renjit Singh, and two, that of Sher Shah Suri. Though originally from Malerkotla, the Nawab had settled in Lahore, and his red-bricked mansion on the Queen's road in Lahore was a celebrated joint for many lettered personalities.

From the times of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, the separatist ideas of the Muslim intellectuals and the formidable feeling that the Muslims are a nation by itself had been evolving. For nearly sixty years, these thoughts evolved and developed of their own without any interference from any one else, but later, the Hindus started reacting and retaliating to these. Some of the premises remained either explicitly or implicitly through out; that the Muslims are separate, that the Muslims are a nation, and that the Muslims can not live with any one else. The solutions to this Hindu Muslim problems were searched by many, and eventually the Muslim leadership started demanding a federal system and this is where we see almost all other Muslim intellectuals by 1929. the characteristics of the federal systems could have been varying with different intellectuals, but they remained there with the idea of a federal system with near autonomy for the Muslims. Two among the Muslim intellectuals differed, both Durrani and Maikash wanted more than this near autonomy, and

implicitly wanted a Dar-ul-Islam, a separate Muslim nation from India. Both are Punjabis, the Nawab is also a Punjabi, there is no ruling out of their influence on the Nawab.

The All India Khilafat Conference was holding their annual session in December 1929 in Lahore. The Nawab was the chairman of the reception committee. In the capacity of the chairman of the reception committee he delivered a speech on the last day, the 31st of December of 1929. The speech which was made in Urdu, came to something like 62 pages roughly. He began by saying "At this stage of Indian politics, the separation of the Ali brothers from Mahatma Gandhi is, in principle the separation the entire Muslim nation from the Hindu nation, and is a practical manifestation of the reality that the two are separate nations. The one nation is not a mere part or component of the other, which may be merged with it, is in response to demand of present day democracy"(39). The Hindu Muslim problem in India is not "a problem of one nation, but of two permanent nations. The Muslims may be killed off or forced to emigrate from India, but politically they shall never let themselves be absorbed into or dominated by another nation. Muslims can unite with Hindus; they can guarantee permanent peace with them, in the shape of a strong and durable agreement; but they cannot become a part of them"(40). To those who still want India to be one nation, he prescribes a way to it: "And that way is that all her inhabitants adopt one religion. It is simply impossible to have one nation until there is one religion And to achieve that, they should all, by common consent, choose and embrace one of the current faiths, or invent a new religion, and abandon their ancient faiths. But never in the past were religions born of political purposes, nor shall it happen in future"(41). After thus rejecting any possibility of one Indian nation, he goes on to say that "But I want to put it to you that there is absolutely no need to create one nationhood. Why can't we find such a solution of this political difficulty as will enable the two nations to enjoy separate existence without fear of absorption and annihilation, ad to live a life of unity, progress and peace? Why don't all the nations, live a life of unity, progress and peace? Why don't all the nations, who are at present at one another's throat, agree to divide the various areas of the country in such a manner as to eliminate all Hindu Muslim rivalries and all quarrels about separate and joint electorates? I appeal to my Hindu and Sikh brethren to give up, for God's sake, their ambition to swallow up each other. This country is not too small for all of us to live in peace Let us do away, once and for all, with sectarian and national conflicts, and, after dividing the territories anew, settle down in our own provinces as distinct nations"(42). The Nawab then draws out a plan of division and advises the Muslims to stop asking for their rights from the Hindus and to go for a separate home land. "The freedom and progress of India depends on this: the Muslims should be given in northern India a territory containing two or three provinces, or one which could be made into one province, where in their majority should not be less than 80%. Similarly in eastern India, Bengal should be so divided as to leave the Muslims with an 80% ratio in the population. The Muslims should demand a country or a home land, instead of asking for rights"(43).

The Muslim conviction that nationality consists of religion becomes the tool here. When the concept of nationality is based on religion, only people of one religion can form a nation, or people of one religion can even make many nations as one. With this conception, it had been easy for them to speculate of a larger Muslim bloc, spreading from India to Europe. It had also possible for

them to speculate of a unity with Afghanistan, and even Iran. They could well think of inviting the Afghan Muslims to invade India and then to support them when they come with their armies.

It is nothing but natural if one thinks of the essential ingredient to a nation is religion, then the questions of Hindu Muslim unity shall simply seem funny and impossible. Till this time, the very end of 1929, all the official Muslim demands had been in terms of separate electorate and a federal system in India, where the Muslims could have a considerable say. They were taught the fear of slavery under the Hindus by the Muslim intellectuals, and all that they wanted in principle was a freedom from this fear of a Hindu domination. The Muslims hitherto was asking for safe guarding their religion and identity etc., but now for the first time, the explicit demand for a separate nation appears. Given the situation, there was nothing else to do at all, and given the situation, there was no other option other than to divide India, no matter how painful that might have been. It had been proved again and again that the Muslims shall never be happy until they find separate Muslim land, as they will detest all non-Muslims. There will never be peace and tranquillity in India, so long as India's Muslims feel that India is a Hindu nation and the Muslims are a separate nation. All other arrangements, adjustments were bound to fail; separate electorates, federal system, safeguarding the Muslim interests and all such things would have not done anything to calm the agitating Muslim minds, and the disturbed minds of their intellectuals. With this situation, and with the kind of present Indian democracy which lets any one have any kinds of freedom even at the risk of national security, if India was not divided, all the terrorist camps of present day's Pakistan would have been housed in India and the entire Muslim community in India would have been clamouring to the out side world that there is a huge human rights problem in India for the Muslims from the Hindus. They would abet and sponsor terrorism, and at the same time make claims that they are being persecuted and tortured by the Hindus. This shall be sufficient to confuse the international agencies, and they would keep going on in their desired manner.

It was perhaps India's and Indians fortune that India became divided. The Muslims who wanted a separate nation got it. The Indian Muslims could now live peacefully with other religions with no much difficulty. There are hardly any Muslim intellectual in today's India to mislead Indian Muslims, and even if some one does so, it shall not meet with much success. That is primarily because there is no religious authority issuing them instructions and orders.

Reference

1. Raj Kumar Ametti, *speech*, Delhi, "Tej", 20, March, 1926
2. Speech at Kanpur, 'Sher-i-Punjab', 19, September, 1926. Also see Herman I Arthur, 'The Political Career of Motilal Nehru', unpublished PhD Thesis, Columbia, 1945.
3. Editorial, 'Sudhram', cited in 'Wakil', 6th February, 1926.
4. Quoted in 'Zamindar', 24th April, 1927
5. *Arya Vir*, 25th June, 1927.
6. *Speech at the third Hindu conference at Oudh, Ayodhya*, 5th April, 1928.
7. take for instance the Sindh Khilafat Conference resolution no. 1 sukkher, 27 – 29, October 1928, quoted in Seth Haji Abdullah Haroon, 'The Constitution of the Future Commonwealth of India and the rights of Muslim Minority', Karachi, 1928, p. 28
8. *IQR*, 1928, Vol II, pp. 403 – 404
9. Quoted in 'Through Indian Eyes', TTI, 14, March, 1928.
10. Shafat Ahmad Khan, 'What Are The Rights of the Muslim Minority in India?', Allahabad, 1928, p. 66
11. 'Hindu', 21st October, 1929.
12. 'Milap', 27th October, 1929
13. Shaikh Mushir Husain Kidwai, *letter*, 'The Times', 29th October, 1929
14. Quoted in M.R.T (ed), 'Nationalism in Conflict in India', Bombay, n.d, p. 186.
15. JS Hoyland, 'An Indian view of Western Civilisation', *Nineteenth Century*, December 1929, pp. 757 – 773.
16. Sir Azizuddin Ahamad, 'The Indian Minorities', London, n.d, pp. 2 – 7
17. *Articles of Lala Lajpat Rai*, 30th November, 5th, 14th and 17th December 1924, in the 'Tribune' of Lahore.
18. KK Aziz, 'A History of the Idea of Pakistan', Islamabad, 1997, pp. 145 – 146.
19. Anwar Qidwai, 'Iqbal aur Tasawar-i-Pakistan', NW, 21, April, 1965.
20. An Indian Mohammadan, 'The Indian Moslems', London, 1928, p. 190.
21. A correspondent in India, 'The Indian Inquiry: Punjab and the Commission', The Times, 14th March, 1928.
22. KK Aziz, pp. 155 – 156
23. *The Hindustan Times*, 16th September, 1962.
24. Penderal Moon, 'Divide and Quit', London, 1961, p. 21.
25. Leonard Mosley, *op.cit.*, pp. 282 – 286
26. Ajithkumar MP, *India-Pakistan Relations The Story of a fractured Fraternity*, Delhi, 2006.
27. Munshi Abdur Rahman Khan, 'Tamir-i-Pakistan awr Ulema-i-Rabbani', Multan, 1956, p. 48.
28. Aga Khan, 'A constitution for India, II: Grouping of Free States: The Bavarian Model', The times, 13th October 1928.
29. FK Khan Durrani, 'The Future of Islam in India', Lahore, 1929, p. 12.
30. *Ibid*, p. 23
31. *Ibid*, p. 69
32. *Ibid*, pp. 69 – 70.
33. *Ibid*, p. 85. The capitals are in the original
34. *Ibid*, p. 86.
35. Stated in AS Khurshid, 'Origin of Pakistan: Trends that Lead to Partition', TPT, 23, March 1962 and the same authors 'Sahafat Pakistan Aur Hind Mein', Lahore, 1963, p. 451. The series of Maikash's articles were named 'Hindi Musalman Ke Liye Alag Watan', that means separate home land for Indian Muslims
36. *Ibid*.

37. East India (Constitutional Reforms): *Report of the Indian Central Committee*, 1928 – 1929, London, 1929, Cmd 3451, pp. 6 – 72.
38. *Haily (United Province Governor) to the Viceroy*, 3rd December, 1929, 'Hailfax Collection' c. 125/5.
39. *All India Khilafat Conference ka Khutba-i-Istaqbalia jo Nawab Sir Muhammad Zulfiqar Ali Khan Sahib ne Mazkurah Conference mein 31 December 1929 ko Irshad Farmaya*, Lahore, 1929, p.15.
40. *Ibid*, p. 22
41. *Ibid* pp. 22 – 23
42. *Ibid*, p. 24]
43. *Ibid*, p. 26.

Chapter -5-

The Critical Year of 1930

The year 1929 was phenomenal till the very last day and filled with many incidents. The year 1930 is even more filled with incidents and evolution towards creation of a separate state for the Muslims. Muslim demands of safe guard and security on the plea of an impending slavery from the Hindus thins out to this dangerous proportion of separatist demand, which indeed was implicit with the Muslim intellectuals right from day one. What ever was spoken and argued, all were with just one single desideratum, of creating a Muslim land out of Indian soil. Nothing was more; and nothing was less. Everything else was just alibis, excuses and polemics towards this.

Mohammad Iqbal, the poet who changed from being an Indian nationalist to a Muslim separatist to demand a separate Muslim state makes the year 1930 with his formidable presence. Iqbal wrote at one point in time that 'Sare Jahan se accha Hindustan Hamara' to mean, of all the nations in the world, India is the best; he compares India to a bouquet, by calling it as a gulstha, and also warns that 'mazhab nahi sikhata, apaz mein bair rakhna....' To mean, that 'no religion teaches any one to hate....'. The same poet who warns Indians that religions do not teach to hate one another now turns into a fundamentalist Muslim to formidably demand a separate Muslim nation out of India. This, precisely, is the "negative evolution" of the poet, Muhammad Iqbal. India had accepted this particular poem of Iqbal as one of their national songs, but Pakistan does not mention this one particular poem as the poetry of Iqbal, among many others. The poet enjoys a status which is unique in Pakistan, un equaled by any other.

People in academia say that one of the most researched texts in the world is the Holy Bible. Similarly, in the context of Pakistan, one could say that one of the most researched person is Muhammad Iqbal. On no other Indian Muslim so much was written, spoken and studied, to the extent that it had even become an Iqbal 'Industry'. The newly coined Urdu word 'Iqbaliyat' is popularly used in Pakistan to denote studies concerning Iqbal, and no bibliography on Iqbal seems to have been attempted; which if attempted shall exceed a book with more than 1500 pages(1). The 21st of April, the death anniversary of Iqbal is a public holiday in Pakistan, seminars, symposia etc., are widely organised, heads of states issues messages and so on. Every print media in Pakistan issues supplements and makes it a big event, everything in the usual Muslim boisterous manner. Festivity, and very good food, much money spent from public exchequer. Perhaps the devotion to Iqbal seems little above and over, but that is not at all our business and concern here.

There are some corollaries with the Muslim society and the Communists at certain points, and they are very interesting. The Muslims are totally uncritical of anything Islamic, and anything of their 'own'. Muslim faith totally surrenders to what is 'supposed' to be stated as belonging to Al-Queran with any kind of intellectual as no exception. If there are exceptions, then they will simply be annihilated, which is besides the point. At the same time, they will be critical of anything which is not 'Islamic' and so on. Thus within the Muslim society there shall be no criticism, and with out the

Muslim society there shall be all criticisms. The Communists are also the same lot. Now a days, with the significance of the theories of Marx so completely gone, the only left over hope for the communist academicians rests in the school of critical theories like the one that called the Frankfurt school. Communists teach to be critical of everything; but once one is in the Communist fold, there ends all criticisms. Since there are no 'eligible' communist societies in the world, a practical enquiry concerning this is impossible to provide any proof; but from the Communist parties all over the world this can simply be proved. Both the people, the Muslims and the communists use the tool of criticism towards others, and never to themselves, which becomes rather strictly forbidden. Peculiar arrogance is yet another commonality with both of them, apart from fundamentalism. The only 'right' is what they say, while all others could be wrong.

To study Iqbal is a near impossible task now a days; since there are so many things written and spoken about him, but hardly anything is original. People had attempted their hearts out to glorify Iqbal, to an extent that there was no criticism or speaking anything unpleasant about him. Iqbal was so glorified with the halo around him and so much was written about him in desperate admiration, had it been not in Islam, he could have easily found himself to goddom. All these create much confusion and difficulty, it becomes nearly impossible to know about Iqbal authentically. There is not a single biography on Iqbal which is a proper one with references indicating sources, either in English, Urdu, or in any other language. Generally like in most of the vernaculars, there are hardly many books in Urdu with proper quotes, references with sources; which is equally applicable to the works on Iqbal as well. The English works on him are also not different here; added with the sanctity attached to Iqbal in the Pakistani society many of such works also comes nearer to being fairy tales, where Iqbal is one of extreme authority. The Pakistani society, which is constantly looking for Muslim heroes, did not leave any stone unturned in making both a hero and a legend out of this poet. Something akin to the status of Aristotle in ancient Greece, Aristotle, a man of authority, who knew everything and who had answers to everything. One story here is interesting: when some one had a doubt as to how many teeth a horse might have, some one asked him to count and find out. This person was punished because he did not answer that let us ask Aristotle! Aristotle might have well deserved this treatment, but in Pakistani society, it was the Muslim over glorification that put Iqbal as the myth. His political writings and speeches are neither collected nor edited properly, his private papers are not collected and edited and published and made available to scholars; perhaps the need was not felt by any of his admirers.

An important mile stone from Iqbal is his presidential address to the All India Muslim League's annual session at Allahabad in December 1930. It is here that the demand of a Separate Muslim state was first formally made; which stands testimony for Iqbal as the first popular dreamer of Pakistan. But this speech was never reprinted with or without introduction and explanation, except in three or four collections by people like Shamloo and SA Wahid. Other reproductions made by some others are not much accurate. One is left with the 'faithful' rather than scholars of Iqbal here. A vernacular Indian poet, Kumaran Asan in Malayalam language writes: 'yesterday's folly to the dumb heads could be a tradition today; which could easily turn into a theory tomorrow'. Precisely this is what happens in case of Iqbal in the Pakistani society. Unknowingly or even knowingly created errors from 'aura' turns into theories and facts as well as laws here, and it makes it

extremely difficult to go closer to the personality of Iqbal when some one really tries to know this person. One could safely say that history has been killed and over enthusiasm to make this man greater and greater like those Mughal emperors had mutilated many facts.

The coming of Muhammad Iqbal

The annual session of the All India Muslim League was held at Allahabad in December, 1930. The address delivered there on the 29th of December 1930 by Muhammad Iqbal became very significant (2). The full address comes to 22 pages, which begins with the usual modesty and decorum, and then turns into what it had become famous for. Iqbal says:

“I have given the best part of my life to a careful study of Islam, its law and polity, its culture, its history, and its literature. This constant contact with the spirit of Islam, as it unfolds itself in time, has, I think, given me a kind of insight into its significance as a world-fact. It is in the light of this insight, whatever its value, that, while assuming that the Muslims of India are determined to remain true to the spirit of Islam, I propose, not to guide you in your decisions, but to attempt the humble task of bringing clearly to your consciousness the main principle which, in my opinion, should determine the general character of these decisions”(3). At the very outset, we see Iqbal making Islam as an authority that has to be heard, believed and followed, which, according to him, all Indian Muslims do. The authority of Islam is a ‘world-fact’, which makes it trivial to think of it as otherwise or anything else. Thus the entire existence of an Indian Muslim ought to be upon and centring around the religion of Islam and the principles given by Islam, which as Iqbal implies, comes natural to the Indian Muslims.

The religion of Islam is “an ethical ideal plus a certain kind of polity” which is “the chief formative factor in the life-history of the Muslims of India”. The “basic emotions and loyalties” of Indian Muslims arises from the religion of Islam, which makes the Indian Muslims a “Well defined people, possessing a moral consciousness of their own”. Iqbal sees the Indian point very well; “India is perhaps the only country in the world where Islam, as a people building force, has worked at its best”. But then, the philosopher Iqbal with a PhD in Philosophy makes a logical fallacy here, the simple Aristotelian logical fallacy of ‘Hysteron Proteron’ of putting the cart before the horse. He does see the Indian point very well, but is unwilling to give the credit to India, which spontaneously implies Indian culture, which automatically becomes the Vedic culture at its roots, which is undoubtedly one that is now known as the Hindu’s. The speciality of Indian Muslims is their Indianness, and not their being Muslims. The speciality and greatness of the Indian Muslims comes from the fact that they are Indians, and not from the fact that they are Muslims. If Islam is the special effect as Iqbal argues, then all world Muslims should share it. If in being Indian is the special effect, then all Indian should share it, and it indeed is the case with the Indians. Hindus, Buddhists, Jains, Sikhs, Christians, Jews and the Muslims: all inherit the same Indian culture almost alike, which makes them distinct, a distinctness that Iqbal happily claims. Unfortunately, Iqbal refuses to accept this being Indian, the speciality in his claim, which is proved against Iqbal through the history of Pakistan once the Muslims became separate and considerably lost their

being Indian. On the contrary, Iqbal explicitly states that the greatness of Indian Muslims “is almost entirely due to the working of Islam as a culture inspired by a specific ethical ideal”, an ethical ideal, which he does not want to associate with Indian culture. Certainly the special ethical ideal which he speaks of can not come from Arabia or else where; for, had that been the case, Muslims would have been special every where. He does speak of a “remarkable homogeneity and inner unity” of the Indian Muslims, but fails to even notice the unique epistemology of India which is the unifying factor, in spite of being a Philosopher. He makes the fundamental mistake of saying “the presence of laws and institutions associated with Islam” is that makes Indian Muslims special and homogenous. He had not acknowledged the togetherness aspect of Indian epistemology that unites Indians internally, a unity that stands through ages and till date with promises to the future as well. The only thing that divided India through tens of thousands of years of her history is the religion of Islam and nothing else, all others and all other apparent differences had co existed and still do co exist as variations as well as varieties instead of differences in India(4).

Iqbal then turns to Europe and Christianity as the polluting aspects of Islam. Westernisation is “rapidly changing the out looks of the present generation of Muslims both in India and out side India”, and because of this, “our young men” go after them considering them “as living forces in their own countries”. Interestingly, he understands the protestant revolt as some thing that had destroyed Christianity, instead of something that had made the Christian principles grow and updated in time. He says with the protest of Martin Luther, “the universal ethics of Jesus” got broken down into “many national and hence narrower systems of ethics”; the “one” had broken down to “mutually ill adjusted many”. This indeed is alarming for a Philosopher to make such folly. The criticism of John Stuart Mill to his father James Stuart Mill and Jeremy Bentham is significant here. When the son Mills claims that he would prefer to be a ‘most unhappy Socrates than the happiest pig’ to prove that his fathers hedonistic calculus was wrong, and to say that pleasure is something not to be quantified; and further to make the point, what is quality, cannot be quantified, he had made an important contribution to Philosophy. Iqbal looks at Christianity as something of a whole and sects of Christianity as its part. The concept of whole and part in religion makes quality quantifiable, thus involving in reductionism. Iqbal, an Indian at least then, should have known the theories in Upanishads that speaks about the part – whole concepts. Interestingly, the Upanishads say that with the Metaphysical whole part relation, if the part is apparently taken out from the whole, the whole still remains a whole and the part yet another whole, the whole never ceasing to be a whole in any circumstances. The Philosopher Iqbal, if had not gone through this Philosophy of Vedanta and the theory of ‘Illusion’, then had missed out the entire Indian knowledge and wisdom in spite of his physical presence in India like many other Indians. The ‘universal ethics’ of Jesus is not a chunk of something that reduces itself by becoming many. As a matter of fact, by becoming many, it develops and grows, and becomes acceptable to many given both space and time. Iqbal had been very short sighted here. Christianity had evolved and developed into a secular religion, instead of the early ‘I am the only right one and mine is the only right religion’ to become universal. Iqbal thinks just the opposite. Islam, on the contrary had not allowed any interpretations and developments through space and time, and they still remain narrow, fundamental, and it becomes easy for one to turn them into terrorism.

And Iqbal now speaks as a fundamentalist and fanatic. He accuses European states of de-linking religion from the state and making religion a private affair. The European states are those "which recognise territory as the only principle of political solidarity" instead of religion. Thus in the European outlook, religion is that of a "complete other worldliness"(5). Religion ought not to be excluded from the state. It was Martin Luther who destroyed both Christianity and Europe, and in the world of Islam, such a 'destroyer' like Luther is "an impossible phenomenon". Here he ventures into theology and say that in Islam, a destroyer like Luther is impossible, since Islam is a universal polity whose fundamentals "are believed to have been revealed"(6). Thus he justifies the concept of 'Dar-ul-Islam', which essentially makes states also religious, and in this context, fundamentally Islamic. Christianity, according to Iqbal, divides the unity of man into spirit and matter and Islam does not divide so. "In Islam God and the universe, spirit and matter, church and state are organic to each other", and for Islam, "matter is spirit realising itself in space and time". He says that it is the mistaken separation of the spiritual and the material that excluded the religion of Christianity from European states, and otherwise, they would have been theological states. The confidence of Iqbal is that Islam can not have a destroyer like the Martin Luther, since the very structure of Islam does not permit the coming of any such destroyer. Islam, thus is a "living force for freeing the outlook of man from its geographical limitations", making it a natural phenomena for the Muslims to live together under Islamic states, Islamic states under one umbrella wherever it is spatially possible. The only dynamism of any sort, for both individual and state, comes only from Islam, as "religion is the power of the utmost importance in the life of individuals as well as states". The future of Indian Muslims simply "depends as a distinct cultural unit in India", or they will be gone. Speaking about future, Iqbal says that it shall be foolish to worry about the destiny of Muslim states, because "Islam itself is destiny and will not suffer a destiny"(7) at all! The epistemology of togetherness, oneness and unity, which is essentially Indian, from Indian Philosophy, which is based on the Vedic culture and not on any religion, is misunderstood by Iqbal here as Islam. He thinks that Islam shall be the unifying factor and hence any state based on Islam is bound to be homogeneous and coherent to exist with impeccable unity. He totally mistakes Indian culture for the religion of Islam, and becomes so completely off the mark.

So much about the first session of his presidential address in the 1930 annual session of All India Muslim League. He titles the second session as "The Unity of Indian Nation". The entire idea here is to establish that India has no unity and the unifying factor shall be religion, and it is impossible for Muslims to live in India as an integral part, and hence the need of a separate Muslim state. It had already been stated by him that Islam is an ethical ideal and a polity. (The concept of ethical ideal, I am convinced that, is borrowed from the concept of Indian 'Dharma', which shall be not unusual for a Philosopher, who is born and living in the land of Philosophy; India). He speaks: "Is it possible to retain Islam as an ethical ideal and to reject it as a polity in favour of national politics in which religious attitude is not permitted to play any part?" Quran does not permit religion as a private affair for individuals. The religious concept of Islam is "organically related to the social order which it has created" and there fore, "the construction of a polity on national lines, if it means a displacement of the Islamic principles of solidarity, is simply unthinkable to a Muslim". Here we find Iqbal quoting Renan and says that India is not a nation at all. There are many religious and caste groups, and they "have shown no inclination to sink their respective individualities in a large whole". Thus, the unity of India can not be sought in Renan's "moral consciousness", and it can

only be sought in “not the negation, but in the mutual harmony and co operation of the many”. It is “on the discovery of Indian unity in this direction that the fate of India as well as of Asia really depends”. Since Iqbal is not mentioning Indian culture as the unifying factor, which he can not upon his belief that religion shall be the unifying factor, which is again derived from Quran, he is now looking out for an alternate principle for unity for the sake of argument. “If an effective principle of co operation is discovered in India it will bring peace and mutual good-will to the ancient land which has suffered so long, more because of her situation in historic space than because of any inherent incapacity of her people”(8).

Iqbal says that he had been trying to look for anything that can constitute an internal harmony for Indians. Since all his efforts fail to bear any fruit, “I have no hesitation in declaring that, if the principle that the Indian Muslim is entitled to full and free development on the lines of his own culture and tradition in his own Indian home lands is recognised as the basis of a permanent communal settlement, he will be ready to stake his all for the freedom of India”. Then he tries to disguise his communalism and fundamentalism, “the principle that each group is entitled to free development on its own lines is not inspired by any feeling of narrow communalism. There are communalisms and communalisms. A community which is inspired by feeling of ill-will towards other communities is low and ignoble. I entertain the highest respect for the customs, laws, religions and social institutions of the other communities Yet I love the communal group which is the source of my life and behaviour; and which has formed me what I am by giving me its religion, its literature, its thought, its culture and thereby recreating its whole past as a living operative factor, in my present consciousness”(9). Iqbal is fully convinced that there is no principle of unity for India in his experiment and search. The only thing that ever can unite India is this communalism alone. He is sure that communalism “in its higher aspect” shall be “indispensable to the formation of a harmonious whole in a country like India”. Naturally, “a Muslim state within India” is such a communal idea, and thus, “the Muslim demand for the creation of a Muslim India within India is, therefore, perfectly justified”. He then demands that the session should emphatically endorse the resolution passed by the Muslim Conference on the 1st of January 1929 at Delhi, and says “Personally, I would go further than the demands embodied in it. I would like to see the Punjab, NWFP, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state. Self-government within the British Empire, or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim state appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims at least of North-West India”(10).

Iqbal explicitly demands a separate Muslim state. “The life of Islam as a cultural force in this country very largely depends on its centralisation in a specified territory”. This when is done, “will intensify their sense of responsibility and deepen their patriotic feeling”. He is ambitious as usual about the future to say “possessing full opportunity of development within the body-politic of India, the North-West Indian Muslims will prove the best defenders of India against a foreign invasion, be that invasion the one of ideas or of bayonets”. He justifies this demand for a Muslim state by saying that it is based on “a genuine desire for free development which is practically impossible under the type of unitary government contemplated by the nationalist Hindu politicians with a view to secure (11) permanent communal dominance in the whole of India”. The Dar-ul-Islam to him is very ‘scientific’. Islam is a state “conceived as a contractual organism” which is “animated by an ethical ideal which regards man not as earth-rooted creature, defined by this or that portion of

earth, but as a spiritual being understood in terms of social mechanism, and possessing rights and duties as a living factor in that mechanism”(12). Thus, all Muslims in the world becomes one, could live under one rule, and one nation, and at the same time, can not live with any non-Muslim, and can not live in a nation not ruled by non-Muslims, and in short, a Muslim can live only in a Dar-ul-Islam! This should be a pathetic situation indeed for the Muslims, given the way the world is. Like all other Muslim leaders of that time, Iqbal is also sure that once the separate Muslim state is given, the Muslims would live in peace and make definite progress towards prosperity. They would be perfect neighbours of India, and their Hindu ‘brethren’. They will safe guard India in the frontiers, not only from ideological invasion from the West, but also from invasions of foreign armies. Now, if we venture to look at what the very friendly neighbouring Muslim states of India is doing, it is really a matter of great laugh in the light of the above promises. The very friendly Muslim states are now training grounds of Jihadi terrorism, with explicit aim of creating problems within India, attacking Indian parliament, attacking various parts and important offices in India through bomb blasts, printing fake Indian currencies and dumping containers of them within India and the like. What, bitter, contrariness!

After establishing that Muslim state is a necessity and Muslim state is both a theological and Philosophical outcome of the holy text, Iqbal goes on to explain how the Muslim state ought to be. He mentions Sir John Simon and the Commission, the Round Table and everything as well as the federal systems envisaged. Then he concludes: “Thus it is clear that in view of India’s infinite variety in climates, races, languages, creeds and social systems, the creation of autonomous states, based on the unity of language, race, history, religion and identity of economic interests, is the only possible way to secure a stable constitutional structure in India”(13). The rest of his speech is analysing the various ideas of the proposed federation, the threat for Muslims if the princes join the federation and the like. He then makes a warning to the makers of constitution that it is going to be dangerous if they ignore Muslim demands. “We are seventy millions, and far more homogenous than any other people in India. Indeed the Muslims of India are the only Indian people who can fitly be described as a nation in the modern sense of the word. The Hindus, though ahead of us in almost all respects, have not yet been able to achieve a kind of homogeneity which is necessary for a nation, and which Islam has given you as a free gift Nor should the Muslim leaders and politicians allow themselves to be carried away by the subtle but fallacious argument that Turkey and Persia and other Muslim countries are progressing on national, ie, territorial lines. The Muslims of India are differently situated. The countries of Islam outside India are practically wholly Muslims in population”(14). He says that the Hindus are divided among themselves into castes languages and territories, but Muslims are one lot. The kind of homogeneity Muslims have is not found among the Hindus, and the ‘homogeneity’ India has is a ‘gift’ from Muslims. What he says is simply this; the Muslims are united; they are aggressive and fighters, if nothing works out, then the Muslims shall take the streets to civil war.....

He ends his speech with such an indication: “If these demands are not agreed to, then a question of a very great and far-reaching importance will arise for the community. Then will arrive the moment for an independent and concerted political action by the Muslims of India. If you are at all serious about your ideals and aspirations you must be ready for such an action I have got definite views on this subject; but I think it is proper to postpone their expression till the

apprehended situation actually arises. In case it does arise leading Muslims of all shades of opinion will have to meet together, not to pass resolutions, but finally to determine the Muslim attitude and to show the path to tangible achievement. In this address I mention this alternative only because I wish that you may keep it in mind, and give some serious thought to it in the mean time I am not hope less of an inter-communal understanding, but I can not conceal from you that the feeling that in the near future our community may be called upon to adopt an independent line of action to cope with the present crisis. And an independent line of political action, in such a crisis, is possible only to a determined people, possessing a will focalised by a single purpose. Is it possible for you to achieve the organic wholeness of a unified will? Yes, it is I do not wish to mystify any body when I say that things in India are not what they appear to be. The meaning of this, however, will dawn upon you only when you have achieved a real collective ego to look at them”(15). The concluding remarks of Iqbal are definite and categorical. Should the Muslims be not satisfied; in spite of all commissions and round tables and discussions, Iqbal is making them ready for an ultimate and final assault; until they get what they want. How this could be, and what these assaults should be etc., are left for any one to imagine.....

Iqbal is strongly advocating Dar-ul-Islam, Islamic states. Islam can not be separated from state, and for the Muslims, state has to be Islamic. He weaves out a philosophy to substantiate this claim. Islam is an ethical system and polity, state and religion can not be bifurcated. “Islam does not bifurcate the unity of man into an irreconcilable duality of spirit and matter. In Islam God and universe, spirit and matter, church and state are organic to each other. Man is not the citizen of a profane world to be renounced in the interest of a world situated elsewhere. To Islam, matter is spirit realising itself in space and time”(16). For a Hindu, this is nothing new indeed. Spirit, that Iqbal calls is the ultimate reality, and the Philosophy of Upanishads speaks much as well as very well about these things. Body, or matter is illusory, and the only reality is the mind, *ātman*, which is the ultimate reality itself. There is no dualism, no dichotomy at all. The dualism which is apparent between matter and spirit is illusory, the theory as propounded by *Saṅkarāchārya*, through his interpretation of Upanishads as the *Advaita Vēdaṅta* or ‘Unqualified Monism’. Using the categories used by Iqbal, it could be said that spirit is permanent while matter is not. But the interpretation of Islam by Iqbal messes the whole thing up. If Islam does not bifurcate spirit and matter, then it should give primacy to spirit over matter to concede that spirit is ultimate and matter is not. If matter is unimportant, then why should he speak of an organic unity between spirit and matter? If he speaks of such an organic unity, then he is actually bifurcating matter from spirit, implying that they can exist independent of one another, hence the need of an organic unity. If they are capable of independent existence, then it shall be difficult to attribute primacy to any one of them. Given this, where is the role of God as creator? Where is the distinction between the creator and creation? Iqbal could be blamed of putting what is creation at the same level with the creator, which shall indeed be a theological fallacy. Iqbal has only one agenda, he wants to prove that there is no place in Islam for separation of religion and state, spiritual and secular, private life and public life. He had strongly and explicitly demanded for an Islamic state from India, though at this point some could say that his demand was for an Islamic state within India. But it indeed was a demand for an Islamic state from India.

Strangely, this important speech from Iqbal, especially as the president of all India Muslim League did not make much of an immediate impact. The one important reason for this is worth noting, since this had gone much into both the making of Pakistan as well as the functioning of Pakistan. The elements of separatism within the frame work of Indian Muslims were at work right from those days, though latent, but powerful. Iqbal, a Punjabi, was not much acceptable to non-Punjabis a difference which was to surface later in the state of Pakistan. Some of them treated the demand of Iqbal simply as 'a poet's dream' and some even must have thought about him as a romantic, as the Germans thought about Max Muller. Though many attempts were made by the pro-Punjabi Muslims to popularise Iqbal's speech, it had not made any serious impact. The very fact of Iqbal becoming the president of All India Muslim League in 1930 also is from the fact that other non-Punjabi Muslim leaders were attending the Round Table and in London, or else most likely Iqbal could have not been made the president of AIML in 1930, though he was later made president of the Muslim Conference in 1932. Another point why Iqbal could not make an impact in the desired sense is from the Hindus ignoring his speech. It is usual for the Hindus to ignore first and see whether or not some thing is harmful, or could be tackled differently before jumping all out into it. Hence the Hindus opted to ignore his speech and let it die a natural death if the Muslims do not go after it seriously. However, some pro Punjabi Muslims did try their best to popularise the 1930 speech made by Iqbal as the president of AIML.

A journal in Urdu, published from 'Pindi Bahauddin' under the name of 'Sufi' had translated the speech into Urdu and printed it, and circulated thousands of them free(17). It is not that people did not note his speech, but the Round Table Conference in London carried the headlines. News papers did report the Muslim League president's address who by then was very popular as a poet, but the Punjabi Muslim lobby was not happy with this alone, they got it translated and circulated it free in many thousands. Some national news papers made editorials of his speech, and yet, the Hindus generally ignored the shrills of attack from Iqbal. The 'Inquilab' from Lahore continued writing a dozen of editorials on his speech in January 1931 seeing the general indifference from the Hindu quarters. The paper Inquilab made out editorials to say that Iqbal had suggested the partition of India into Hindu and Muslim lines. The same news paper repeated Iqbal's threat of waging civil war if this Muslim demand is not realised, and made out another editorial on the 11th of January 1931. Another news paper, 'The Hamdard' from Lucknow wrote an editorial stating that "Islam's survival as a cultural force depended on the establishment of a Muslim National State in Northern India" in the editorial of the 5th January, 1931. The news paper continued to say if such an Islamic state is created, then, such a state "will cause a patriotic fervour among Muslims and they would be in an ideal position to defend India with all the might at their command against a possible attack from the Bolsheviks or the Afghans. This is the best solution of the Indian problem". This suggestion that the Muslims, if are given what they demand in the NWFP, shall defend India from any possible aggression from beyond the borders had become the usual way of Muslim speech those days. This had been often done with an underlying threat, that, if they are not given what they want, then the same forces also could work against the Hindus and join with the invaders, undoubtedly so, if they are Muslims. For a long time this Muslim cat and mouse game had been running, of defending Indian borders in explicit terms and of inviting Muslims to invade India in implicit terms. And as usual, the Hindus constantly ignored both explicit as well as implicit suggestions.

The impact of the speech had found its way to Calcutta. Three students from Calcutta, namely Raghbir Ahsan, Fazal Rasul Khan Afridi and SM Salim joined together to "suggest initiation of a 'Muslim Ideal Fund' in order to finance a vigorous propaganda drive in support of Iqbal"(18). Further, what happened to this 'Muslim Ideal Fund' and the three student's ambitions are not known. Some Muslim intellectuals still wished that they could keep the speech of Iqbal live to meet the expectations of a Dar-ul-Islam. A Muslim quarterly from Hyderabad named 'Islamic Culture' touched upon the speech in autumn 1939 to say that the demand "for fullest cultural autonomy" was "much appreciated and supported by the Muslims"(19). Beyond these, the speech of Iqbal could not make any impact in those days. But with the becoming of Pakistan, Iqbal became a legend, and glorification of Iqbal knew no bounds. To the Pakistani society, he had become nothing less than a prophet in the long line of the institution of prophecy in Islam, which is nothing but a borrowed theory from Judaism. To make the contrast clear, look at a book published in 1967 which says: "The schemes suggested by others had not attracted any attention at all, but the one put forward by Iqbal attracted world-wide attention for the first time. Not only this, he worked for it and got the scheme approved by the majority of the Muslim leaders as well as British statesmen"(20). The glorifications crossed all limits and bonds that imaginations took charge of fact telling in independent Pakistan.

The All India Muslim League, the party to which Iqbal was the then president, did nothing in particular about the suggestions made by Iqbal in the presidential address. They "did not incorporate the presidential suggestion in any resolution"(21). Further, the subject committee of the Muslim League "did not consider it worth while to adopt Iqbal's proposal of 1930 in the form of a resolution"(22). Chaudhary Khaliqzaman, much later, speaks about this phenomenon in the following manner: "it is a wonder that when this clarion call was made from the Muslim League platform no one took any notice of it and no one moved any resolution in the session approving the scheme enunciated at Allahabad". He adds, "it is strange that the Council of the Muslim League did not take any notice of the President's address nor put forward any concrete proposal touching the subject"(23). The Allahabad session passed seven resolutions in all on various subjects including condolences of some Muslim leaders, and yet nothing was mentioned about what Iqbal had spoken during his presidential address(24). There could be two possibilities why this was not done. Either the All India Muslim League did not understand what Iqbal had been speaking, or they deliberately avoided the Punjabi's ideas out of their own majority non-Punjabi bias. It seems that it is the con feeling to a Punjabi that worked its way to sideline Iqbal's ideas by them as there could be no other explanation. As it was mentioned earlier, the internal differences among the Muslims were at work even then- at a time the intellectuals were so much into the Muslim unity and so called oneness to the extent of dreaming a Muslim state including places like Turkey and Afghanistan- which of course had to work its way through divisions and divisions within them Muslims, in times to come. Subsequently, the formidable Muslim unity had seen political division of Pakistan into a new country of Bangladesh apart from many sectarianism within Islam as well as linguistic and regional divisions other than from tribes among them.

And Iqbal remained not a very acceptable Punjabi for another ten years. No one took note of his 'famous' presidential address of the 1930 Allahabad session of the All India Muslim League till 1940, when, suddenly everything changed so dramatically. The Muslim League had passed the

Lahore resolution in 1940. With this 'revolutionary' resolution, some of the Muslim League autochthones started looking back in time for some kind of support for what they had just then resolved, and they found the Presidential address of Iqbal of the 1930 Allahabad session. In the mean time Iqbal had already passed away, but before his passing away, he had been at another thing, of continuously writing letters to Muhammad Ali Jinnah, which the Muslim league authority did not know at the time of finding Iqbal of the 1930 Allahabad session. Iqbal had written long letters very recently to Jinnah pleading the very urgent need of a separate Muslim state, but at this point in time, it was not known. The letters written by Iqbal to Jinnah were not known to public during those days. However, after the 1940 Lahore session of the Muslim league that made a Pakistan demand, Iqbal and his 1930 presidential address becomes precious, as he seems to be the first leader from the Muslim platform to make a Pakistan demand and it is ten years old by 1940. The announcement that the Pakistan demand was already made by the poet a good ten years ago made the whole proposal for Pakistan simple and acceptable as well as respectable to the Muslim leaders. In the inside, there were many who wished for a separate Pakistan, but then, there was this question, 'who will bell the cat?' Will the demand be acceptable to majority Muslims? With all these, there is no saying that majority of Muslims agree to separatism. For last sixty years and above, the Muslim intellectuals were constantly making the point that Muslims are a separate nation, the Hindus are the enemies of the Muslims, and the Muslims can not share the same soil with the Hindus and so on. But all these had been the views and points only of the intellectuals. How common Muslims would take these things, there was no guarantee. The very Indian society was not at all conducive to any kind of separatism that could become a major issue with majority of people partaking in the movement. And as a matter of fact, majority of the Muslims did not subscribe to the separatist ideas of Muslim League, though the leadership eventually succeeded in creating a Pakistan. Even at the instance of the birth of Pakistan, more Muslims stayed back in India than the entire population of Pakistan, who did not loose trust in their neighbours, the Hindus, and till date, it is not only the case that they do not regret of staying back in India, but also they are happy to have made a wiser decision, and relieved to be in India when they look at Pakistan.

And in sheer frustration that with all efforts Pakistan could not get majority of Indian Muslims to their side mentally at least, the Pakistani society began to call Indian Muslims as 'Kafirs' as they pose themselves to be the perfect Muslims and the Indian Muslims as polluted ones simply because they live in a society mixed with non-Muslims. Today, the general projected feeling within Pakistan is that the Muslims of Pakistan are pure and the Muslims of India are not so pure, or something like that of a down graded ones. This is the nasty result of any separatist ideologies and hate philosophies, the separatism and hatred once generated is never going to end by itself, until totally stopped, it will go on and go on into newer areas of differences and destruction. Now Pakistan is in a real mess; they can not abruptly and altogetherly end the hate philosophy as well as separatism even if one of their 'monarch' so desires, the very existence of Pakistan as a separate nation simply rests on these things only. Indeed no one from Pakistan shall be wanting to end separatism and hate philosophy, as they shall then not know what could be done next. Hence, it had descended upon them as a perennial curse that their society shall ever be facing differences, separatism, and hate philosophy within themselves. And thus, what the Muslim League leaders of the 1940s anticipated was right, they knew that such separatism and hate

philosophies will not become a permanent phenomena with the Indian Muslims how ever they may try and how ever they may use religion and the fear of God's wrath. For a time the people may be moved, but certainly not for long, and that is India for all.

It is this knowing the Indian mind that did not make any Muslim leader accept the responsibility of asking for a Pakistan outside the intellectual circle. That indeed was a risk; whatever the intellectuals might be speaking of, whatever the religious leadership might have in their minds, there was no saying that how the majority of common Indian Muslims might be reacting, and no one was there to take this risk. Now, with the name of Iqbal associated with the first demand for Pakistan, the leadership of 1940 Lahore session of the AIML was actually relieved. He was by then no more, and should something go wrong, the blame could be put on him, and as a matter of fact, Iqbal had become something of a scape goat for them. At this point, there was no hesitation in calling him both a seer and a prophet, they started calling him a 'Hazrat' un hesitatingly. "The idea of Pakistan, it is well known, originated in the brain of the late Hazrat Allama Iqbal Dr. Iqbal made articulate what was so far struggling for expression". He tries to explain the ten years of silence regarding this: "Of course, at first Dr. Muhammad Iqbal's idea was taken up by a few persons only. A person here and there was attracted to it; a person here and there was struck by it. But the idea grew and grew, and presently the whole Muslim nation was talking of it, discussing it and digesting it. And finally they became unanimous over it"(25). If one is just to suppose that Pakistan did not occur, then what would have been the place of Muhamad Iqbal in history could only be imagined. Now that things had worked for the separatist intellectuals with Iqbal projected as the real champion in front, he became a complete legend, an Iqbal industry began and a new term in place, Iqbaliyat. How ever, at this point in time, Quereshi does not know about Iqbal's letters to Jinnah, and he does not even refer to the 1940 demand of the Muslim League of Lahore session. But the importance of Quereshi lies in the fact that he had provided a lead, and something to begin with, for many who came after him. And indeed there were many to take and follow this lead which started the beginning of the Iqbal industry. In 1941, a writer using the pen-name 'A Punjabi' (Mian Kafayet is the original name) states as a matter of fact that there was "a scheme of separation in which their salvation lay"(26) provided by Iqbal way back in 1930 itself. The development were fast after that. Some years later, a book carried an introduction from Muhammad Ali Jinnah himself traces the origin of the idea of Pakistan and find Jamaluddin Afghani as the first crude idea provider of separatism, and Muhamad Iqbal as the one to provide the idea of Pakistan in concrete terms. "Subsequently, it owed inspiration to late Sir Muhammad Iqbal who proposed the amalgamation of the North Western Muslim Provinces to a single state"(27). Then many followed trend, and there began a stream of writing in this line. With each repetition the assertion became more strong, which was becoming an unquestionable historical phenomena subsequently. "Thus Iqbal was the father of the idea of independent and sovereign Muslim states in India"(28) and "only Iqbal" is "the real father of Pakistan" and the Allahabad presidential address from Iqbal was "the first concrete shape of the latent demand for a Muslim India"(29) etc. started appearing with ease and surety. Iqbal academy came into existence, Iqbal researches became un leashed, Iqbaliyat had become a phrase, and many 'Iqbalites' came into existence. It all had reached a point that now it had become impossible for any one to search for the real Iqbal, he had already become a national hero, and anything that is said against the established conventional ideas on Iqbal would amount to anti-nationalism. This indeed had

deterred many from both pursuing the real Iqbal and speaking about the real Iqbal, for if any one does so, then he immediately becomes the black sheep. Thus, even sensible people stayed away from such hazards for prudence' sake.

Most likely, what must have happened to Iqbal may be this. India had a Mahatma Gandhi, something of a legend to many. It had become difficult to conceive of this person and his personality, and had he lived in distant past, most likely, hardly any one could have believed that such a person could have really existed. Pakistan always has this habit of juxtaposing India where ever they could. Perhaps they want to keep proving to themselves that they are equal or at par with India. This attitude had been consistently present with Pakistan right from the very inception of that state. The Gandhi had become a legend, though no one had consciously made him a hero of the Indians. Right from the times at South Africa, the public life of Gandhi had peculiar differences, and his exclusive techniques of resistance had amazing effects. When he came to India and entered Indian politics after a good two years of study of the situations, he became more dynamic and active, each time with new methods and techniques to 'fight' the colonial oppressors. Even with no one's conscious or unconscious assistance, Gandhi had become a great man and a legend through time, all by himself, actually without wanting to be one. Independent Pakistan, as usual, wanted to have a legend for themselves, and fixed Muhammad Iqbal for that, with the reason that he was the very first Muslim to have thought of a separate home land exclusively for the Muslims, and made him a prophet and a seer. What really made Muhammad Iqbal a legend in Pakistan is this juxtaposition, and nothing else. This they had been doing even in sports, be it in cricket or hockey. When a Pakistani sports team loses to India, it is very difficult for the society to accept defeat, and it is not exaggerating that the sportsmen could often get beaten up and their property destroyed by common Pakistanis. This had been the real story behind the making of a myth out of Iqbal, who otherwise was a man of his own merits and greatness without all these.

As a matter of fact Iqbal carried this idea of consolidating the Muslims of NWFP, Sind, Punjab and Baluchistan as a single block. He hoped that this bloc shall remain a source of power to all Indian Muslims, and did work towards this, and not for a Pakistan as people said later. A year after his Allahabad address, in 1931, a letter written by Iqbal to Sir Francis Younghusband reveals his attitude to the Hindu Muslim problem. The letter says that: "While realising the seriousness and importance of the Hindu Muslim problem, with which this country is confronted today, and the practical difficulties involved in finding a satisfactory solution to it, I can not allow myself to believe, as many people unfortunately do, both here and in England, that all human efforts directed to uniting the two communities are doomed to failure. I am not ashamed to say that in solving this problem we may need the assistance of Britain guided by the best motives". Further, "If you transfer political authority to the Hindu and keep him in power to any material benefit to Great Britain, you will drive the Indian Muslim to use the same weapon against the Swaraj or Anglo-Swaraj Government as Gandhi did against the British Government. Moreover, it may result in the whole of Muslim Asia being driven into the lap of Russian Communism which would serve as the 'coup de grace' to British supremacy in the East. I do not myself believe that the Russians are by nature an irreligious people Since Bolshevism plus God is almost identical with Islam, I should not be surprised if in course of time either Islam would devour Russia or Russia Islam. The result will depend, I think, to a considerable extent on the position which is given to the Indian

Muslims under the new constitutionI shall have no objection to be ruled by the Hindu if he has the tact and ability to govern, but I cannot worship two gods. It must be either him or British alone, but not the two together Somehow I feel hopeful that some solution to the Indian communal problem will be found at the next RTC which would satisfy all parties, including the British To the recognition of a common ideal and to the avoidance of friction in advancing along the path of self-rule, let us here and in the west address ourselves”(30). This letter was written in 1931. His Allahabad address was in 1930. If Iqbal really called for a Pakistan in his Allahabad address, then this letter would not have been written. Perhaps he never dreamt of a separate state of Pakistan, and all that he was demanding was maximum for the Muslims and a Muslim state within Indian state. Another thing with this letter is the tone of threatening the British, that the Muslims might join hands with the Communists in Russia if they do not get what they want from the British. This threat had been running through time, at times the threat of inviting the Afghans to invade, at times forming of all Muslim nations’ unity, and now this idea of joining the Communists even with the plea that though the Communists do not approve of religion, by nature the Russians are not irreligious. Vary interesting speculations indeed. What is more, there is no mention of the so called clarion address at Allahabad. Most likely, Iqbal was hoping of a united Muslim whole who could juxtapose the Hindu majority and nothing more from that. As a matter of fact, Iqbal never thought about a Pakistan, and Jinnah, though demanded a Pakistan, never believed that it could really materialise, he was using the Pakistan demand to get maximum for the Muslims, and did not know what to do with the Pakistan when it eventually happened.

There are some clues to this problem. Did Iqbal really speak of a separate Pakistan? Or was it something else? Pakistani historians and the state of Pakistan desperately wants to say that the first ever call for a Pakistan came from Muhammad Iqbal, as the president of All India Muslim League, and from the presidential platform. The Official Doctrine of Pakistan is this and this alone, and they are intolerant to anything different from this. The OD had actually put fear in the minds of at least some historians like KK Aziz, who wanted to search for the truth, some of them found it, but were unable to speak it out. KK Aziz tried to tell it the softest manner, but then he had to flee from Pakistan on account of this. In any case, there are indications as to what really Iqbal was. An English educational missionary, Dr. Edward Thompson wrote a criticism of Iqbal’s Allahabad speech in the Times in early October. He called it as “Pan-Islamic plotting” and: “And I am not arguing against the establishment of Muslim ‘communal provinces’ in North-West India. But what Sir Muhammad Iqbal demands is a confederation ‘within or without’ the Indian federation. Look at the map and see what sort of defensible frontier would be left to the rest of India”(31). To this, Iqbal writes a reply. “May I tell Dr. Thompson that in this passage (he quotes from his address the sentence starting ‘I would like to see the Punjab....’) I do not put forward a demand for a Muslim state, out side the British Empire, but only a guess, at a possible outcome in the dim future of the mighty forces now shaping the destiny of the Indian sub-continent. No Indian Muslim with any pretence to sanity contemplates a Muslim state or series of states in the North-West India outside the British Commonwealth of Nations as a plan of practical politics”. Iqbal himself interprets his speech that he was not ‘asking’ for a Pakistan. He also adds: “Although I would oppose the creation of another cockpit of communal strife in the Central Punjab, as suggested by some enthusiasts, I am all for a redistribution of India into provinces with effective majorities of one community or another on lines advocated both by the Nehru and the Simon reports. Indeed, my

suggestion regarding Muslim provinces merely carries forward this idea. A series of contented and well organised Muslim provinces on the North-West frontier of India would be the bulwark of India and of the British Empire against the hungry generations of the Asiatic highlands”(32). It seems very well that Iqbal also was afraid to ‘bell the cat’. The Muslim separatists and Muslim intellectuals were never sure of the majority of Muslims listening to their calls of a ‘separate home land’, and no one among them wanted to take the risk.

This precisely is the chief problem even in today’s Pakistan. They never have a satisfying answer to the question as to why at all the Muslims separated from India. They never had an answer to this, and they will never have also, except the cooked up and projected story of a Hindu domination of the Muslims, which always remained a matter of joke to the Hindus. The Hindus never understood the projected Muslim fear of a Hindu domination; as such a thing was never in the history, of past as well as present. Intolerance to the other had never been in the Indian culture, and on the contrary, the culture of the Vedic civilisation had always welcomed both ideas and culture from far flung lands. It had thus become something near a very joke, of speaking about who first spelt out the idea of Pakistan. Each of them trying to put it on another’s shoulder, and found Iqbal who had then died; probably no one expected that the newly found Pakistan shall make a great national hero out of him.

The separatism that the Muslim intellectuals had been spelling out for nearly seven decades in India did not have its desired effect on the common Muslims. As a matter of fact, the majority of common Muslims were far from these things, most likely they did not understand much of these things. The illiteracy among the Muslims used to be high, and most likely all these speeches and writings did not make any sense to them, what actually mattered to the majority of them was their daily bread, their families and such matters which the intellectuals think as mundane and empty. Juxtaposing this, what the intellectuals thought as high and valuable remained empty and meaningless to the common folk. The Muslim intellectuals, through their eighty years of separatist epistemology could not create a sway among the majority, they could not make formidable popular opinion among common Muslims, and win their minds. The only result they could make was much confusions and uncertainties among them.

This could be from two reasons. One, they were not fighting for a genuine and just cause, and their arguments were based on an epistemology which was essentially alien to India. The Indian Muslims, albeit Muslims, remained Indians in spite of what ever international Islamic calls. The ‘inescapable Indianness’ did function within perhaps all of them. Two, there was no leader who was capable of creating such public image like the Gandhi. The Gandhi could move the entire Indian nation just with his words, and it ought to be written in golden letters in history as to how he made the entire India non co-operative, to the extent of taking physical assault from the British Police and yet not reacting to it. Amazing indeed, and unbelievable. There used to be no leader akin to the Gandhi among the Muslims, and even if they had one like him, it is logically impossible for him to function like the Gandhi, for, the premises of Gandhi which had been entirely based on the Vedic values had already been rendered alien to the Muslims with the plea that they are all of the Hindus. The point to ponder is simply this; there was no Muslim leader who could be sure of the popular sentiments of the majority of common folks. Hence, they were careful of staking claims like a separate nation and the like, in spite of their textual conception of a Dar-ul-Islam. The Indian

Muslims lived and still live as one society with the Hindus, and it is not easy to force them out of their traditional relations with the Hindus that had been running through generations. It must have been both sweet and sour, but never mutually exclusive.

This, is still visible with the Pakistan society, in spite of their Official Doctrine of hate philosophy of the Indians. Individually when the people from both societies meet, their first attitude is that of love and friendship. And it is this love and friendship that shall be dominating their relations of all kinds. All kinds of spurious history is taught to the Pakistani society academically right from schools such as 'Muslims were slaves of Hindus in India prior to the independence of Pakistan', and it is thus from the slavery of the Hindus that they won freedom etc. Still, individually at least, the relations are predominantly that of friendship. There is some kind of kinship between the Hindus and the Muslims, a relation that had developed through centuries, and this is what had put the Muslim intellectuals in predicament of making a formidable call for a separate nation, they were only being prudent. Jamaluddin Afghani was essentially an outsider who did not know of the intricacies with the Hindu Muslim relations, and we find him blatantly giving calls for separate Muslim identity. But with the Indian Muslim intellectuals, this was different. They were not sure as to how the common Muslims would react to a separatist call when it really comes to separation. Iqbal was made a scape goat. And this is what made Iqbal a sudden hero for Pakistan out of the very blue, albeit he never meant anything what all these people had been saying as what he had stated. However, Iqbal had become a hero just like that, and had he been alive, he would have died a second death out of shock!

The Muslim leadership were asking for more representation for the Muslims within the frame work of Indian nation still. They wanted equal participation for the Muslims in all walks of life. The All India Muslim Conference made a significant demand then: they asked for satisfactory Muslim representation in the Armed forces. They asked for "an adequate and effective representation of Muslims in all grades of military service and other fighting forces, such as Navy and Air Force"(33). The Muslims were still demanding a federal system and Nehru Committee rejected it; and on the one hand the Muslims were demanding a federal system at this point of the time, as the Hindus kept rejecting it. The demand for a separate Muslim state was far flung. The Ahammadiyya leader criticised Nehru report saying that Muslims can only live under the federal system. (Interestingly, the Ahammadiyyas are not considered as Muslims in today's Pakistan)(34). Aga Khan said: "For while the whole drive of the Hindu movement for self-government was concentrated on the idea of a strong central government and the establishment of an immediate democracy, conceived solely in terms of numbers, in which religious differences counted as such and as nothing more, Muslim opinion had crystallised steadily in favour of a distribution of powers from the centre to virtually self-governing and autonomous provincial governments"(35).

The year 1931 was filled with uncertainties and confusion among the Muslim intellectuals. There were many interpretations and many demands, but none of them really asking for a separate nation, and in a nut shell, they were all asking for some kind of 'protection' from the 'terror' of the impending Hindu rule. There were all kinds of permutations and combinations to escape this impending Hindu 'domination' over the Muslims. There is no point any more in saying that the Muslims were only thinking and feeling how the Muslims would have tried to dominate the Hindus had they been in the majority; they would have never understood the logic in it. Speaking in the

minorities sub committee in the Round Table in 1931 Sir Muhamad Shafi said "To my mind the Federal India of the future with the Central Government in the hands of the majority community, the 4 provinces in which the majority community will be in a minority and the minority community will be in a majority, will itself constitute a guarantee of good treatment by both the communities In the majority of the provinces, our Hindu brethren have the position of advantage In only a minority of the provinces – four – have the Mussalmans a similar position of advantage, with the result that there will be an automatic guarantee of good treatment to both the communities. That will be the permanent solution of the Hindu Muhammadan problem in India"(36).

What an interesting and ideal situation to speculate on the so called Hindu Muslim unity! Here the strength is simply thought of being juxtaposed; and the logic shall be an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. Both communities will have their safety guaranteed, in such a manner that if some thing happens in one province then there shall be immediate retaliation in another province to counter it, in the real barbaric manner and which is far flung from any civilised behaviour.

Muhammad Ali, just forty eight hours before his death, composes an interesting letter to the British Prime Minister which is some what funny, which also happens to be on the 1st of January 1931. He was trying to say that why at all the Muslims should be called a 'minority'; perhaps the term was connoting insult to his dying mind. "A Community that in India alone must now be numbering more than 70 millions can not easily be called minority in the sense of Geneva minorities, and when it is remembered that this community numbers nearly 400 million of people throughout the world, whose ambition is to convert the rest of mankind to their way of thought and their outlook on life, and who claim and feel a unique brotherhood, to talk of it as a minority is a mere absurdity"(37). What more is further required to establish how polluting these ideas are to the Muslim minds, and once they get polluted, they easily get modernised into contemporary terrorism.... They want to convert all world into Islam, and they want all world to think and feel like them, and what is not explicitly stated is how they are going to treat those who do not convert themselves into Islam and that is all.....

Now see what Hazrat Mohani feels in his resolution introduced in the All India Muslim Conference. "Where as the Muslim community is now convinced that the Hindus are bent upon establishing a Hindu Raj in India and whereas the Hindus and the British Cabinet have joined hands to ignore most of the Muslim demands contained in the Delhi resolution of this conference, this committee believes the establishment of dominion status in India and the vesting of responsibility in the legislatures is detrimental to Muslim interests and will, therefore, not be acceptable to them"(38). In April 1931, Shaukat Ali, in his presidential address to the AIMC stated that "no one should forget that we ruled in India for over 850 years, and, on the whole, I think we ruled well We have got to rouse ourselves to realise that our future must be worthy of our past"(39). By now, the Muslim demand had come so close to a federation which shall be so loose, and loose enough to pave way for a separation from India.

There was this demand from the Muslims for a federal system all along; but there were no indication that things could settle even with such an arrangement even if it could materialise. It is just a matter of logic and common sense that how the Muslims would behave in future in spite of

all their assurances of peace and tranquillity. From nothing they were sceptical of an impending Hindu rule from 1857 on, with the thought of India becoming independent appearing as a possibility. They wanted a Muslim rule of a Dar-ul-Islam, and psychologically juxtaposed the Hindus with the Muslim logic. Most likely, they could not have perceived other wise at all; it appears that it was a natural logic in the Muslim minds to conceive and contemplate on a Dar-ul-Islam, and it must have been another natural logic in the Muslim minds that the Hindus think like them, and 'naturally' the Hindus shall be going for a Hindu state. Thus, the whole thing had been a projection from the Muslim minds, of the Muslim intellectuals, who were unable to either think of or conceive of a logic which is distinct and different from that of what is available to them, the epistemology of difference, dislike and hatred. Therefore, as long as they feel that there exist Hindus or any people whom they consider as non-Muslims, they would have continued to resist and oppose, no matter what ever had been their demands been and the results therein. Of course the Hindus counter poised the Muslim attitude, and most likely they would not have been fundamentalists had the Muslims did not initiate and spread fundamentalism. Nonetheless, the Hindu reactions came only after a good sixty years of waiting and, perhaps, suffering.

This is why we find Muslim intellectuals shifting positions and loyalties on and often, and it becomes impossible to either trust or believe in what they speak. At one point one finds a Muslim intellectual making all kinds of promises of peace and co-existence with the Hindus, but the very next moment one also shall find either the same person or an associate violating or going back on the so called promises. This had been ongoing, and till date it is so. In contemporary times, we see the state of Pakistan promising many things but doing nothing of what had been promised; especially in matters concerning terrorism. It is only recently the President of Pakistan had confessed that they themselves had created terrorists with 'some specific objectives' and later, after 9/11, the terrorists had been going against the state of Pakistan. However, history tells us that it is nothing for them to go back on words, as well as violating promises made. Hence all these discussions and demands etc. would have only turned out simply fiascos until the Muslim land is made, and till then all these would have to go on, and once the Muslim land is made, there was to be all kinds of infighting in all kinds of names and reasons. On a final analysis, the world has absolutely no escape from these things, they would go on; and the impact, for all of us to bear with. At this point in time, so many people were talking so many things, and nothing used to be much worthwhile.

Rahmat Ali

There is no comparison of Iqbal with Rahmat Ali. Iqbal has a great stature as poet, president of two organisations and later as the founder of Pakistan. Rahmat Ali has nothing of these, yet, on a scrupulous analysis, one can find that it was Rahmat Ali who made the first call for a Pakistan in the real sense and not Iqbal as it is widely projected. Iqbal was dillying and dallying on ideas, but Rahmat was clear and certain about a separate home land for the Muslims. However, Pakistan had ignored him and failed to give him his due.

Rahmat was born in a small village in Hoshiarpur of the Punjab, India. He was born on 16th November 1897. His father was Haji Chaudhary Shah Muhammad, who was a land lord of the middle order. In 1912 he matriculated from Jullandhar, and then joined Islamia College Lahore and completed graduation in 1918. After graduation he served as tutor in Aitcheson College in Lahore till 1923. Then he worked as a private secretary to the Mazari chief, and in 1930, went to England for higher education. He entered Emmanuel College in Cambridge in 1931, and completed Law to receive the degree in 1933. He lived in England and practiced Law, came to live in Pakistan in 1948, but the Pakistan government had ousted him from Pakistan and he had to go back to London again. He returned to Cambridge, and died there in 1951, he was buried in Cambridge. In all, though he was the first person to speak about a separate Pakistan from India, he did not receive any acknowledgement from the Muslim separatists who had become champions of separatism after the inception of Pakistan, to become national heroes.

It had already been mentioned that right in the 1915s, Rahmat Ali spoke for a separate Pakistan during his under graduate days. This was in Lahore, and there is no evidence to it now, except his own words. Rahmat Ali himself did not mention this idea of 1915 until his days in Cambridge, again as a student. When he was in England as a student the Round Table Conference was in progress, and he went to speak to the Muslim leaders from India to tell them that the federation which they are now demanding would only destroy Islam in India. The RTC was working towards a federal set up which the Hindus were opposing tooth and nail, and Rahmat Ali was asking them not to ask for a federation even. He told them that they should demand for a separate Muslim sovereign state, which is going to be the only solution. The Muslim leaders were struggling for a federation which neither the British nor the Hindus were willing to give, and naturally, the Muslim leaders would have thought Rahmat Ali as crazy and not practicable. They thought that it is a waste of time to talk such things, and obviously, they did not listen to him. When he was not heard, he decided to publish his own scheme by himself (40).

Thereupon Rahmat Ali issued a declaration for the '30 million' Muslims of India, entitled 'Now or Never: are We to Live or Perish for Ever?' on the 28th of January 1933. He called upon the world for "sympathy and support in our grim and fateful struggle against political crucifixion and complete annihilation". In the very first sentence he named the home land for the Muslims, for the very first time and he called it 'Pak-Stan'. The same name was used by others when the Muslim home land became a reality and they called it 'Pakistan' instead of Rahmat Ali's Pak-Stan. As a matter of fact Rahmat Ali's Pak-Stan is the Pakistan itself; to mean the same thing: Pak means pure and Stan means place, locus etc. Pak-Stan is in Urdu language and Pakistan shall be in Persian: the language spoken in Iran which the Indian Muslims had borrowed to juxtapose the Sanskrit language of the Hindus. Sanskrit had been the classical language used by Indians both to teach and learn, as well as the language for intellectual discourses and in short for all intellectual, literal, religious and all such important activities. No one must have spoken this language as mother tongue, yet all educated Indians used this language for purposes including communication, and Sanskrit had thus become a common lingo franca for the ancient Indians. There is nothing amazing about this; as the Indians still use a common lingo franca to communicate as well as educate which is not at all their mother tongue, the English language. In fact, English was only

replacing Sanskrit. The Muslims, when in rule for considerable period in time did not want to use something from the Hindus. On the one hand they wanted to create everything that of their 'own' as distinct from the Hindus, and on the other hand, they wanted to juxtapose Hindus in every aspect. We find Pakistan doing this very thing even today, as they go on repeating all that India does even in things like cricket and hockey. Thus during the Muslim rule, the Muslims started using Persian language as their 'classical' language as against Sanskrit. That is why people like Jamaluddin Afghani could go around speaking in the Muslim pockets in India without many difficulties, and the Persian speeches of Afghani used to be counted as his expertise in the Muslim classical language. It was just his mother tongue as a matter of fact. The Muslims in India continued their obsession with the language of Persian, and wanted to believe in their some kind of Persian connection, which continues to exist in Pakistan till today. This shall at once be revealing if we chance to look at the very national anthem of Pakistan to find the excess influence of Persian in it. Ironically, Indian Muslims had stayed away from Arabic, though that was their religious language. Thus Rahmat Ali's Pak-Stan and today's Pakistan is nothing different from one another and it is indeed Rahmat Ali who shall be credited for coining the term for their nation, Pakistan.

Indeed Rahmat Ali deserves credit to this. He also deserves credit for another thing, for which actually the Pakistan intellectuals had discredited him. Rahmat Ali spoke about thirty million Muslims of India where, in his Pak-Stan, he had included only Punjab, the NWFP, Sindh and Baluchistan, but excluded Bengal, Assam, the south and the Muslims living there. On account of this, the Pakistani intellectuals had discredited Rahmat Ali saying that he failed to speak for the entire Muslim community in India. But, may it is inadvertent on his part, he was right and farsighted. If he had not included Bengal with the perception that the Bengalis are not going to stick with the 'normal' Pak-Stanis, then history proved him to be right in 1971. If he thought that the problem of Bengali Muslims must be taken separately, then too he was right. But the speakers of the entire Muslim community as one shall never acknowledge that the Muslims and particularly the Muslims of all communities are not going to stick as one single unit as expected by the intellectuals and predicted by them as an Islamic bloc. By Pak-Stan, he says: "by which we mean the five northern units of India viz., Punjab, North Western Frontier Province (Afghan Province), Kashmir, Sindh and Baluchistan". Definitely, he excluded Bengal and Assam. He was thoroughly disappointed and unhappy with the then Muslim leadership who refused to listen to his 'well thought' out ideas and plans about his Pak-Stan, and he does not hide his unhappiness. He attacks the leaders saying "with reckless disregard to or future and in utter contempt of the teachings of history", these foolish leaders "have submitted, in the name of Hindu nationalism, to the perpetual subjection of the ill-starred Muslim nation", since the short sighted leaders have agreed to federalism (41).

Ali is strongly arguing against a federal system. "Our religion, culture, history, tradition, economic system, laws of inheritance, succession and marriage are basically and fundamentally different from those which inspired the Hindus". He implies something serious indeed. The moving power or factor that moved the Muslims into formulating these things are entirely different from the moving power that moved the Hindus in formulating similar things. Thus the differences among the Muslims and non-Muslims, especially the Hindus becomes structural and constitutional. "We do

not inter-dine; we do not inter-marry. Our national customs and calendars, even our diet and dress are different". If a federation is agreed upon for the Muslim sake in India, then it shall be the "death knell of the Muslim nation in India for ever". The only option for the Muslims shall be a separate nation, as "they deserve and must demand the recognition of a separate national status by the grant of a separate Federal Constitution from the rest of India" (42). In page 2 and 3 of the leaflet he categorically states that his demand is "basically different" from the demand that of Iqbal. Iqbal wanted to exist within Indian federation as a separate unit, but Rahmat wanted an independent nation for the Muslims. He was very much annoyed with the Muslim leaders for even discussing a federation. The Muslim leaders were speaking about safe guarding the Muslim interests, but Ali felt that "However effective and extensive the safe guards may be, the vital organs and proud symbols of our national life, such as Army and Navy, foreign relations, trade and commerce, communications, posts and telegraphs, taxation and customs, will not be under our control, but will be in the hands of the federal government, which is bound to be overwhelmingly Hindu" (43). And then he declares "We will not crucify ourselves upon the cross of Hindu nationalism in order to make a Hindu holiday". His declaration concludes thus: "We are face to face with a first rate tragedy, the like of which has not been seen even in the long and eventful history of Islam. It is not the question of a sect or of a community going down; but it is the supreme problem which affects the destiny of the whole of Islam and the millions of human beings who, till quite recently, were the custodians of the glory of Islam in India and the defenders of its frontiers. We have a still greater future before us, if only our soul can be saved from the perpetual bondage of slavery forged in an all India federation. Let us make no mistake about it. The issue is now or never. Either we live or perish for ever. The future is ours only if we live up to our faith. It does not lie in the lap of the gods, but it rests in our own hands. We can make or mar it. The history of the last century is full of open warnings, and they are as plain as were ever given to any nation. Shall it be said of us that we ignored all these warnings and allowed our ancient heritage to perish in our own hands?"(44)

Here I must speak about the common mistake continuously committed by the then Indian Muslim intellectuals. First of all they do take a great deal of pride in the glory of Islam, but do not quite mention that the glory of Islam what they speak of is the glory of Indian Muslims. It is not the glory imported from any Islamic lands just because and just through Islam alone. Had that been the case, then Islam could have been glorious where ever one may find Islam, which is not the case at all. The so called glory which they take pride in is essentially as well as necessarily Indian and had evolved on this very land. This, the Muslims are not prepared to recognise, and they also deny the fact that they are basically and fundamentally Indians. Their faith systems had been changed at some point in time, but this can not change a society completely. They can not deny the influence of Indian culture and tradition in making the so called glory of Islam a reality within India. The Indian Muslim intellectuals used to make another mistake so often by calling themselves as the defenders of the frontier, which is also wrong. The Muslim forces were only defending the Muslim rule in India, and nothing else. Thirdly, their optimism that they can progress without being in India had been proved completely wrong with the inception of Pakistan. In Pakistan, all the so called glory of Islam had become some old story, and they had only gone back so completely from what they used to be in India. If the Muslim rule in India had been so glorious, then why Pakistan had become a miserable place after 1947? Actually, Islam had only taken people back in time, and they had denied all contributions of their own ancestors just because the ancestors were not

Muslims. If Indian Muslims were one of the best lot among the Muslims, I would say that it was only through their interaction with the non-Muslims in India. It was the contribution from the Hindus that made Islam and Muslims civilised. Minus the Hindus in Pakistan, they had gone back to barbaric ways of terrorism and insurgencies during the sixty plus years of independent Pakistan. What ever happened to Afghanistan is also happening to Pakistan, and it is only a matter of time for them to decay further in the name of religion. Finally, the demand for a separate land from India had been a fundamental mistake done by the Muslims, who thought that they could be everything, under rating thousands of years of civilisation and wisdom of India. Had they been living in India, they would have progressed much more than what they are in Pakistan today, but they would have continuously blamed the Hindus for every thing. Pakistan still does this blaming game.

Rahmat Ali was all alone in drafting this declaration. Now he wanted some supporters to it and spent months looking for some in England, where he was living at that point in time. He wanted his declaration to have a representative character. With all his efforts, he could get only three young men, who used to live in England then. He wanted them to sign the declaration as a joint venture. Aslam Khan Khattak was a student in Oxford, Sahibzada Sheik Muhammad Sadiq was a law student, and Khan Inayat Ullah Khan was an Engineering student. All the three signed the declaration, but Khattak later backed out from the declaration, though he was made the president to it. Khattak withdrew his support to the declaration of Rahmat Ali, and what happened to the other two is not very well known, though they did not officially back out from it. However he was alone to draft and publish the declaration, as he was no organiser, but only a thinker. What is more, he was not associated with any organisation, and on the contrary, he was very critical of perhaps all leaders of the Muslim organisations. This indeed had alienated Rahmat Ali, as it usually happens with people who hold independent views in any organisation mostly against the organised ideas. What normally people do is to try and get others to support their views through drawing rational lines and arguments without being forceful in them, and when this is done, the ideas shall get moving. Rahmat Ali's notions were very much in the interest of the Muslim separatism and practical; but he remained aloof and lonely, with the unhappiness that others do not heed him. Thus Ali, though the first ever person to call for a separate Muslim land in the real sense, though the first person to have coined the name of the nation became unacceptable to the 'makers' of Pakistan, and eventually when he returned to live in his home land from London, was actually expelled from the newly founded Muslim land to which he gave the name, just to go back to London and die there. So much for Rahmat Ali's aspirations and efforts to the making of a Muslim land.

Rahmat Ali was perhaps more practical than any other Muslim leaders of his times. Thinkers in Pakistan criticise him of being short sighted, as he was only speaking about 30 million Muslims only excluding Bengal and other parts of India. The Pakistani intellectuals feel that at the time of Rahmat Ali, there were 80 million Muslims in India, a major portion from Bengal. Ali had not included another Muslims from any part of India except from Sindh, Punjab, Baluchistan and NWFP. He was practical enough to think that including people from other parts of India may not make his Pak-Stan a viable state. Perhaps he also did not carry the belief that all Muslims of India shall hear and listen to him, so he concentrated on to what is available to him presently. Both these aspects of Ali proved right in later days. On the one hand, all Muslims of India did not opt to

migrate to the newly founded Muslim nation Pakistan, in spite of the newly found enthusiasm of a separate Muslim nation and the pumped in fears of domination of Hindus and a Muslim slavery: something quite akin to the Babylonian captivity of the Jews. Majority of Indian Muslims remained in India instead of going to Pakistan, and Rahmat Ali was right about his number of 30 million Indian Muslims. With all these ninety years of poisoning the Muslim minds, the majority of common Muslims did take the 'risk' of remaining in India against all projected odds to experience later that their decision was just correct of not going to Pakistan. Perhaps Rahmat Ali knew that Bengal Muslims shall not be part of Pakistan, in spite of the projected enthusiasm of a Muslim 'Unity'. This too was proved historically, in just twenty three years of time; Muslims of Bengal fell apart from the so called holy land of Pakistan to become another separate and Islamic nation. Rahmat Ali was firm, unconditional and clear in his demand for a separate Muslim nation of Pak-Stan, and it took another seven years for Jinnah to cop and repeat his call from the Lahore session of Muslim League in 1940.

The 1940 annual session of the All India Muslim League party, with Muhammad Ali Jinnah in the Presidential chair, firmly called for a separate Muslim nation. He was simply repeating many ideas and even words of Rahmat Ali, including the very name Pak-Stan, but now modified into Persian to call it Pakistan. Further, the 1940 session, after demanding Pakistan put the credit (blame) of the first Muslim demand for a separate Muslim nation upon Muhammad Iqbal, who had actually not demanded for a separate nation, but for an Islamic bloc within Indian Union with considerable autonomy for the Muslims. I had already pointed out these things in Iqbal's own words before. The Lahore session, as I had already stated was not at all sure of how the common Muslims of India will take their call for separate nation. The majority of Muslims may not be willing for a Pakistan at all, and the fear was right. And at this point, there was no leader to have accepted a responsibility of making a call for separate Muslim land: though Rahmat Ali would have gladly taken the responsibility. But Rahmat Ali was a loaner and a non conformist to their organisational pattern; he would be dangerous to them. And it is thus that Iqbal becomes the scape goat then, he could not have said anything against it, he had already died and gone, then scape goat, but later a great national hero. It was all Rahmat Ali's ideas, his plans, his declaration, his words, and his coinage of the name: but he was never mentioned anywhere. Desperately alienated and side lined, he had to be expelled, deported and had to die in exile. Later in modern Pakistan, Aziz Ahmad the historian had similar experience when he spoke these very truths about both Iqbal and Rahmat Ali. He too was expelled; albeit he was trying his best to put facts in most pleasant words as one could imagine.

Rahmat Ali knew the importance of his declaration and he was very conscious of its predictable nature. From the following quotation of his, it could be argued that he had wilfully not included Bengali Muslims in his plan. He says "This Declaration and this date will be memorable in history The date marked the birth day of Pakistan, the death-day of India, and the dissolution day of British Imperialism in India. Not only that. This Declaration on that date started an ideological revolution in the life of one-fifth of mankind living in India, a revolution the repercussions of which will be felt through out Asia and the world" (45). This appears to be a self congratulatory note from Rahmat Ali, but it is also realistic. The declaration staked a complete claim for a separate Muslim land, which was inspiring to all those who believed in separatist

epistemology. He had influenced many Muslim intellectuals who were of the separatist epistemology and hate Philosophy, for, perhaps, no one else had hated India and Hindus more than Rahmat Ali.

In 1933, he founded the Pak-Stan national movement and published an 8 page pamphlet entitled 'What Does the Pakistan National Movement Stand For?'. Here he had declared the fundamentals of the Political Ideology of his movement which again had become a source of inspiration to many separatist intellectuals. In this, he had objected to all references even bearing his name 'India', 'Indian', and the like, treating them synonymous with the term 'Hindu'. Such ideas from him had made many others also speak in separatist lines: in February 1933, a Bengali legislature spoke against the Hindus saying that the Hindus are incapable of being 'broad minded'. (Broad mind should mean giving in to the ways of the Muslims as per their desires in whatever manner). In June Haji Rahim Baksh of Punjab wrote in Civil and Military Gazette for the cause of the Muslims and their separate land. In September an Englishman named FF Holsinger put forward a scheme of dividing India into a Muslim nation and a Hindu nation. In 1935, a number of Muslim states and enclaves within India were demanded. In October, Sir Muhammad Yaqub repeated that India is not a country but only a subcontinent in the Rahmat Alian lines. By the end of 1933, the 'Star of India' discussed territorial distribution by Sir Henry Lawrence who had been a former Commissioner of Sindh. The discussion was entitled 'The Balkanisation of India'. The influence of Rahmat Ali had made Sir Henry Gidney to ask for a separate state for the Anglo Indians, consisting of two hundred thousand acres (46). Albion R Banerji, an Indian Christian commentator feared from the influence of Rahmat Ali that about an impending Pan-Islamism and the possibility of an Islamic Empire (47). In the summer of 1934, Abul Kasem said that the Congress was an organisation of the caste Hindus and their nationalism simply meant only Hinduism (48). Sardar Iqbal Ali Shah gave the idea of creating a great Central Asian Confederacy in Central Asia (49). In July one Ainul Islam (pseudonym) wrote to Star of India blaming the Hindus entirely for the Muslim separatism (50). Sir Fazli Hussain spoke to the Viceroy's executive council of 'creating a Muslim majority zone as a counterpoise to Hindu majority areas' (51). In July, Altaf Husain, later editor of 'The Dawn' who used the pseudonym 'Archer' attacks the unity of India in most strong words saying that "THERE SHALL BE A TRUE NATION OF GENUINE PATRIOTS IN INDIA, A NATION OF EIGHTY MILLION MUSLIMS....."(52)

By 1935, the Round Table had met thrice and was discussing the possibilities of the projected federation. A white paper had come out containing the summary of joint recommendations, and a Joint Select Committee of the two houses of Parliament had worked long hours to make its report. A bill for the Government of India had been drafted and was before the Parliament for final disposal. Rahmat Ali had been meeting people, especially the Muslim leaders and kept warning them that a federation shall not be the suicide treaty for the Muslims, but no one listened to him, adding insult upon humiliation. He also met the Committee time and again, but all the Muslim leaders told the committee that the Pak-Stan idea was fantasy cherished by a student and was nothing worthwhile. Insulted and humiliated, Rahmat Ali was frustrated, but did not give up his efforts. On 8th of July, he wrote out a letter and sent it to many people including the members of the House of Lords who were then considering the Government of India bill for finalisation. He had also sent the same to the House of Commons when the bill was before them (53). In that letter he

had argued again and again that the Muslims are a distinct and separate people and it shall be impossible for them to be in a federation which will be under the central government dominated by the Hindus. Muslims are not 'Hindustanis' at all, they will only be suffering all kinds of slavery under the projected federation and the like. Ali writes this letter "on behalf of the people of Pak-Stan" to obtain sympathy and support for their struggle against "the ruthless coercion of Pak-Stan into the proposed federation". He says that "Pak-Stan is not Hindoo in soul nor is its people Hindoostani citizens. It has always possessed a historical, spiritual, territorial and national individuality of its own While Hindoostanis claim Hindoostan as their mother country by birth, we claim Pak-Stan as our fatherland by the same right. If Hindoostan is theirs because they form three-fourths of its inhabitants, Pak-Stan is ours because we constitute four-fifths of the total population" (54). Not taking care of "This great cleavage has existed from time immemorial, and must exist for ever", the Muslim league and other Muslim leaders had made a "shameful surrender" of the right of their nation by agreeing for a federation to live with the Hindus in India. Thus went the long letter of Rahmat Ali to the Parliament, and he also had circulated copies to many of his friends and foes alike. But they ignored the 'babblings' of an 'immature' student who was filled with romanticism and fantasy.

And nothing happened. Rahmat Ali must have been too frustrated and dejected; he had neither written nor published anything between 1935 and 1940 except a letter in *The Times*. He must have been turning inside out like a volcano but we do not know anything about his mental operations during these days. But then, Ali could have been much more vocal and vociferous during these periods, as it was during these periods that Indian Muslims were turning more and more to his Pak-Stan idea of a separate Muslim land. Many students were turning to this very idea and started opting for an alternative for the suggested federalism, and were contemplating of struggles for a separate Muslim nation, Rahmat Ali's idea of a Pak-Stan. It is amazing that he was not in the picture at all, and was doing nothing to make the fire he had ignited spread. Normally, he should have been extremely happy and thrilled finding many followers to his Pak-Stan idea. At once he should have jumped to it leading and guiding them, given his nature, but he remained stone silent. Here one could only state that the kind of shock he might have received from his fellow Muslims must have rendered him silent and frustrated. But then, there is an instance, a very strong instance, which reveals very amazing and new things about his thoughts.

One Halide Edib, a Turkish lady visited India in the mid thirties and had written a book. She is supposed to have interviewed Rahmat Ali and published the ten paged interview in her book, the book which was published in London in 1937. KK Aziz says that Rahmat Ali himself wrote out the interview in the pattern of a dialogue and persuaded the lady to incorporate it in her book. (55) This dialogue makes a startling and interesting point, which must have become 'the reason' that made him so unacceptable and unpopular, and had eventually expelled him off Pakistan. He gives the theory that the Muslims in his Pak-Stan are a separate and distinct lot from the Muslims of the rest of India. Pak-Stan Muslims are 'racially' different from 'Indian' Muslims. Their racial origins are from Central Asia and socially their type of civilisation was totally different from the civilisation of Muslims of Hindustan. He claims that "The Muslims in Pak-Stan are in their national home. The Muslims in Hindustan went there as conquerors. Therefore Hindustan was the Muslim Empire, where for over nine hundred years, they ruled over a vast native majority. But when they lost this

colonial Empire, as distinct from Pak-Stan, the Muslims who settled in these Muslim Imperial dominations of Hindustan became a minority community in Hindustan At the time of the fall of their empire, had the Muslims possessed leaders with vision and courage, they could have preserved the national as well as territorial integrity of their home lands in Pak-Stan” (56). Further he says that most of the Muslim politicians are “a mere crowd of careerists” (57). There are two classes among the Indian Muslims. One, the group of Communalists, who are anti Hindu but pro British, who followed the policy of subservience to the British. The second class are the Nationalists, who are anti British but pro Hindu. These group advances the cause of Hindu Capitalism and Hindu Nationalism. Both these classes are worthless Muslims and who do not have any policy of their own, and both never considered the point that there will be “a distinct home land in Pak-Stan”. The foolish Muslim leadership coerced the Muslims into accepting a federation within India, and the Muslims shall ever be a minority in India under the slavery of the Hindus. That is why he had created a Pak-Stan national movement for the establishment of “an independent and separate Pak-Stan”. The creation of an independent Pak-Stan is the only solution for peace and harmony in the ‘sub-continent’. Thus both the nations can honourably exist and the British imperialism would come to an end (58).

As it is usual with any Muslim intellectuals of that time, Rahmat Ali was also optimistic about the co-existence of the two separate nations as ‘very good’ neighbours (let us not think in terms of the post 1947 Pakistan attitudes). He says that “the national pride of each will be satisfied, and the historic clash replaced by neighbourly good will and friendly co-operation” (59).

Rahmat Ali’s Pak-Stan did not include non-racial Indian Muslims. What will happen to them once Pak-Stan is obtained? Ali is not going to take them into his Pak-Stan to racially pollute the different ones of Central Asian origin. Here, he gives an honest answer: “The truth is that in this struggle their thought has been more than a wrench to me. They are the flesh of our flesh and the soul of our soul. We can never forget them; nor they, us. Their present position and future security is, and shall ever be, a matter of great importance to us. As things are at present, Pak-Stan will not adversely affect their position in Hindustan. On the basis of population (one Muslim to four Hindus), they will still be entitled to the same representation in legislative as well as representative fields which they possess now. As to the future, the only effective guarantee we can offer is that of reciprocity, and, therefore, we solemnly undertake to give all those safe guards to non-Muslim minorities which will be conceded to our Muslim minority in Hindustan But what sustains us most is the fact that they know we are protecting Pak-Stan in the highest interest of ‘the Millet’. It is as much theirs as it is ours. While for us it is a national citadel, for them it will ever be a moral anchor. So long as the anchor holds, everything is or can be made safe. But once it gives away, all will be lost” (60). Further, “Times come when even brothers have to part. Cruel as such times naturally are, the highest good of the Millet must come before anything else The nobler spirits among them appreciate this truth and are, therefore, actively supporting the Movement. They are fully conscious of the fact that Pak-Stan’s struggle is as vital to them as it is to us. We all know that the idea of earth-rooted ness is repugnant to Islam. The world is remoulding itself, and political boundaries are disappearing before the tide of moral and spiritual allegiances. Sooner or later, but sooner rather than later if we can make it, nature’s decrees are bound to be obeyed.

Therefore, if all of us hold fast and remain true to our teachings, we have every hope that the future will see us even closer to one another than we are at present” (61)

How amazingly farsighted and precognitive this Rahmat Ali is! All precognitions of this person had been followed even in detail by the Pakistan nation after its formation. Even the very name he coined for the new nation Pak-Stan stood to become Pakistan. He is categorical that in his Pak-Stan only ‘racially pure’ Muslims shall have place, and claims a racial distinctiveness that the Pak-Stanis are Central Asians in origin as against the Muslims of rest of India. Indian Muslims are resultants of the invading Muslims, whom Rahmat Ali does not openly acknowledge as converted Hindus. He comes as a corollary to the Hitlerian idea of Aryan race, the original Aryan race theory as modified by Hitler to suit his requirement of Nordic Aryans as the purest. Here, Rahmat Ali does the same thing by making the Punjabis and Punjab onward northies racially different to make a distinction between them and other Indian Muslims. It is true that both the race theories are concocted; but it serves the purpose for both. Rahmat Ali being a Punjabi from Hoshiarpur makes himself distinct from other Indian Muslims. And this indeed has become the case in the separated Pakistan nation though no one explicitly states it. Punjabi Muslims in Pakistan makes the upper hand in spite of the Sindhi Muslim factor, and keeps themselves at the apex. The other Indian Muslims who migrated to Pakistan under the impression that it is going to be their Dar-ul-Islam, at once became refugees and second or third rate citizens of Pakistan, a situation, which still is ongoing. In all practical aspects, this racial difference created by Rahmat Ali is still functional in modern Pakistan. What is conveniently forgotten is the fact that all Indian Muslims including the Punjabis, Sindhis, Baluchis and the Pathans are all originally Hindu converted to Islam, mostly under coercion, with the choice made available to them to choose between Islam and sword. Hoshiarpur, and Punjab did not have any ‘original’ Muslims among them. The much celebrated Afghan Muslim case is also not different; the Afghanis were all first Hindus and then Buddhists and then again Hindus prior to the invasion of Muhammad Qasim. Thus the racial distinctiveness is simply concocted, but that had been functional in Pakistan as a matter of fact.

Then look at the attitude towards non Pak-Stani Muslims. Rahmat Ali expresses all kinds of love and affection as well as concern for them, but shall not accept them into the Pak-Stani fold. They have to be different, and separate. Pak-Stan will ‘ensure’ their safety, in such a manner that if the Muslims in India are not treated well, they will also not treat the Hindus of Pak-Stan well in a retaliatory model. This will ensure that the Indian Muslims are looked after properly by the Hindu majority. He correctly says the Muslim attitude, though present Pakistan will not acknowledge; that national boundaries do not mean anything to them. They carry the theory of Dar-ul-Islam and aspire for the same. Thus, once Pak-Stan is founded, their efforts shall be to make India a Muslim nation by making the Muslims a majority in India and then to get the rule in their hands. And this is precisely what modern Pakistan wishes for and propagating among their people which actually causes all their organised national level official support to terrorists and hatred spread against the Hindus. India is not their enemy, but the Hindus in India are. Like Rahmat Ali precognised, Pakistan is trying all out to win the sentiments as well as supports from the Muslims living in India, as Rahmat Ali says explicitly, of finding an anchor in Pak-Stan. Pakistan wants Indian Muslims to treat their nation as a holy land for them, and to depend on them so that they can make the Indian Muslims capable and strong to fight the government of India which is a Hindu majority.

All recent activities from Pakistan, the terrorist training camps, the weaponry support to synthetically created Muslim terrorists in India, the infiltration from Pakistan army in disguise of civilians, the Indian currency printed in Pakistan sent to the Muslim out fits within India, the Bombay Taj Hotel attack, the Indian Parliament attack and so on and so forth are well thought out by Rahmat Ali and rather predicted here. Ali's Pak-Stan shall be functioning as a full supporting source for Indian Muslims in their efforts to make India a Dar-ul-Islam. Pakistan precisely does the same thing, creates terrorists within India using the power of religion and supports them in all possible manners including hi-jacking of aircraft. If one closely read Rahmat Ali, one can find all activities in which today's Pakistan is continuously involving as already predicted by him. The only difference shall be, that, Pakistan denies everything, and Rahmat Ali had already foretold all of them. Pakistan follows Rahmat Ali, but refuses to acknowledge him. In short, all the present attitudes and activities of Pakistan are explicitly stated by him years ago. For all functional reasons, Pakistan shall actually follow him, but shall keep denying that they have anything to do with such things. Again in other words, Rahmat Ali had already foretold what all things in which Pakistan shall be involving against India and the world for the sake of Dar-ul-Islam, in his ideas of Pak-Stan. The only place where he goes wrong is where he predicted that both India and Pakistan shall be good neighbours and shall live in peace and harmony. But then, one can not take this for serious, as, logically, if he keeps his Pak-Stan as an anchor for Indian Muslims, then how can the two nations ever be friendly? The Muslim nation shall be continuously and constantly at the look out for the well beings of Muslims within India to 'ensure their safety'. How can such a nation ever be friendly with their continuous interferences? The only place where he was not so honest is this; for, he had to speak so.

With all these, he was expelled from Pakistan when he finally came to live in there. On the first place, he had made distinction between Pak-Stan Muslims and Indian Muslims, that Pakistan could not openly agree to. Actually they acted exactly as Ali predicted, but how can they openly say so? Secondly, Rahmat Ali was mercilessly critical of the Muslim leadership as opportunists and careerists. He disrespected perhaps all of them. He was daring to speak anything, and thus he could only be a perennial problem to others who project themselves as the autochthones. Thirdly, he was critical of Iqbal as well, and with the formation of Pakistan, Iqbal had become a legend and person to be respected highly. They did not want to give him credit for anything, not even for the name he coined for the new nation, albeit every one still knows that it was Rahmat Ali who coined the name Pak-Stan in Urdu, which was made Pakistan in Persian.

One Rahmat Ali had done so much when we look at him from the perspective of non-Muslim nations. Had there been more Rahmat Alis, the entire world could have been populated with Jihadi terrorists from all Muslim nations. Like the Communists who do not have national boundaries, Rahmat Ali was willing to create Muslims who would wish for Muslim world alone. The epistemology of differences is conspicuous in him; he even goes to the extent of drawing distinctions among the Indian Muslims. What more is further requisite in making all the Muslims in the world only terrorists, if they all start following people like Rahmat Ali?

Reference

1. Major references on works done on Iqbal could be found in KK Aziz, *'The Background of Pakistan'*, Karachi, 1970, and the supplementary editions.
2. The details of the Allahabad session could be seen in *'The Indian Review'*, January 1931, pp. 45 – 46 and IAR 1930, Vol II, pp. 334 – 348. The whole speech is reproduced by FK Khan Durrani in his book, *'The Meaning of Pakistan'* 1946 rep, pp. 149 – 175 and in Shamloo, *'Speeches and statements of Iqbal'*, 2nd Ed, Lahore, 1948, pp. 3 – 35.
3. All India Muslim League: Allahabad Session: December 1930: *Presidential Address by Dr. Sir Muhammad Iqbal, Barrister-at-Law*, Lahore (Issued by the author, printed at Kapur Art Printing Works, Lahore), p.1.
4. *Ibid*, p. 1
5. *Ibid*, p. 2.
6. *Ibid*, p. 2 – 3.
7. *Ibid*, pp. 3 – 4
8. *Ibid*, pp. 4 – 5
9. *Ibid*, p. 6
10. *Ibid*, pp. 6 – 7
11. *sic*
12. *Ibid*, pp. 7 – 8.
13. *Ibid*, p. 9
14. *Ibid*, p. 19.
15. *Ibid*, p. 20 – 22.
16. *Ibid*, p. 2
17. S Nazir Niazi, *'Maktubat-i-Iqbal'*, Karachi, 1957, p. 67
18. AS Khurshid, *'Immediate Reaction to Iqbal's Allahabad Address'*, TPT, 21st April, 1963
19. MAC, *'North-West India'*, *Islamic Culture*, October, 1939, p. 499
20. SA Vahid, *'Studies in Iqbal'*, Lahore, 1967, p. 302.
21. Ram Gopal, *'Indian Musalmans'*, Bombay, 1959, p. 2312. also, LS May, *'Iqbal and his philosophy'*, Iqbal, January, 1958.
22. Ahmad Shafi, *'Two Punjabi Musalmans'*, *The Indian Review*, August, 1942.
23. Choudhry Khaliquzzaman, *'Pathway to Pakistan'*, Lahore, 1961, pp. 108 – 109, 238.
24. *Resolutions of the All India Muslim League from May 1924 to December 1936*, Delhi, n.d, pp. 47 – 49.
25. IH Quereshi, *'Pakistan: An Ideal or Practical Politics?'*, TET, 9th August, 1940. This was reproduced in full in *'India's Problem of her Future Constitution'*, Bombay, n.d, pp. 103 – 104.
26. A Punjabi, *'Pakistan: The Critics' Case examined'*, Lahore, 1941, p. 7
27. MRT, *'Pakistan and Muslim India'*, Bombay, 2nd ed, 1946, p. 14.
28. Iftikar-ul-Haq, *'Pakistan and Constituent Assembly'*, Lahore, 1946, p. 78
29. S Hyder, *'Progress of Pakistan'*, Lahore, June 1947, pp. 24, 35
30. Muhammad Iqbal to Sir Francis Younghusband, CMG, 30th July 1931. Reproduced in Shamloo, *'Speeches and Statements of Iqbal'*, Lahore, 2nd ed, 1948, pp. 164 – 169
31. Edward Thompson, *Letter*, *'The Times'*, 3rd October, 1931
32. Muhammad Iqbal, *Letter*, *Ibid*, 12th October, 1931
33. AIMC executive board resolutions, Simla, 4 – 6 July, 1930, IAR 1930, Vol II, p. 328.
34. Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, *'The Nehru Report and the Muslim Rights'*, Qadian, 1930, p. 14.

35. *'The Memories of Aga Khan: World Enough and Time'* London, 1954, p. 216.
36. Sir Muhamad Shafi, *speech in the Minorities Sub Committee, 1st January 1931, 'Indian Round Table Conference'*, op.cit., p.99.
37. *Ibid*, p. 142.
38. *IAR* 1931, Vol I, p. 284.
39. *Mawlana Shawkat Ali, Presidential address, AIMC special session, New Delhi, 5th April, 1931, CMG, 8th April, 1931*
40. Chaudhary Rahmat Ali, *'Pakistan: The Fatherland of The Pak Nation'*, Cambridge, 1947 (3rd Ed), pp. 222 – 224.
41. Chaudhary Rahmat Ali, *et.al.*, *'Now or Never'*, Cambridge, 28th January, 1933, p.1. (This is a four paged leaflet, which can be seen in KK Aziz, *complete works of Rahmat Ali, Islamabad, 1978 – 80, 2 vols*). {Vol II is now confiscated by the publisher}.
42. *Now or Never*, p.2.
43. *Ibid*, p.3.
44. *Ibid*, p. 4.
45. *'Pakistan'*, p. 227.
46. VR Gaikwad, *'The Anglo Indians'* Bombay, 1967, p.30. KE Wallace, *'Life of Sir Henry Gidney'*, Bombay, 1945, pp. 188 – 196.
47. Sir Albion Rajkmar Banerji, *'The Indian Triangle'*, London, n.d, pp. 234 – 244.
48. Abul Kasem, *'Beware of the Traps'*, TSI, 29th June, 1934.
49. Sardar Iqbal Ali Shah, *'The North-Eastern Frontier: A Central Asian Confederacy'*, *Ibid*, 2nd July, 1934
50. Ainul Islam, *'On Men and Matters'*, *Ibid*, 5th July, 1934.
51. Durga Das, *'India from Curzon to Nehru and After'*, London, 1969, p. 166.
52. Archer (pseudonym) *'Slings and Arrows'*, *The Musalman*, 19th July, 1935.
53. Chaudhary Rahmat Ali, *a letter of 8th July 1935, addressed to 'my lords'*, the letter is unpaginated.
54. *Ibid*
55. KK Aziz, *'A History of the Idea of Pakistan'* Islamabad, 1987, p.362.
56. Halide Edib, *'Inside India'*, London, 1937, pp. 352 – 356
57. *Ibid*.
58. *Ibid*
59. *Ibid*
60. *Ibid*
61. *Ibid*

Chapter -6-

Evolution of Intellectuals Amidst Confusions: 1936 – 1937

The separatist Indian Muslim intellectuals continued to be in troubled waters with all kinds of confusions. For the nationalists, the Indian nationalist Muslims, there were hardly any confusion, they were already convinced of the role of religion in their lives as well as the Indian context; they hardly had any fear of an impending Hindu domination. They did not have much theoretical support to their convictions; they had to draw their strength from history as well as from immediate experiences of their own neighbourhoods. Nationalism had become something like a family affair for many Muslim families, nationalist used to be so en block. They stood with the Indian National Congress and Indian nationalism unconditionally. They could have been carried off by the separatist Muslim intellectuals and their fears, they could have been lured into the promises of a Dar-ul-Islam, they could have been carried off through the ideas of Muslim purity and the Hindu presence that pollutes; but it is amazing that there still remained a considerable majority of Muslims who did not believe in the Muslim nation and separatist theory. They remained in India and still remain as an integral part of this nation and contradictory to what the separatist Muslim intellectuals who projected theories of a Hindu domination and Muslim slavery.

The confusion and fear was entirely those of the separatist intellectuals. They did not even know which course to adopt, they did not know whether or not the federal system for which they were supposed to be fighting for will help them, and at the same time they kept wishing for a totally separate Muslim state. But there remained this fear in them; how will the general Muslims react if they give an open call for a Dar-ul-Islam? How many will come out in support of them? Every separatist Muslim leader had this fear at the back of their minds though no one dared to spell it out: as no one dared to give an open call for a separate nation. Let us see the separatist Muslim thinking during these times, their agonies, uncertainties, confusions, fears and above all; predicaments. There were much dillying and dallying, sometimes here they used to be and some times their, and at times contradicting one another and even oneself in many places.

On the 4th of January 1936, the Khilafat Conference was in their session at Calcutta, where the presidential address was made by the Nawab of Dacca, Khwaja Habibullah. His presidential speech was a kind of confession, a confession coming out of confusions created by the Muslim intellectuals right from 1857, through speeches, writings and organisations. Let us look at his presidential address: "We are 'Indian Muslims'. We refuse to believe that our being true and loyal 'nationals' of an Indian 'nation-state' should be a bar to our being faithful members of the 'Commonwealth of Islam' which is the mightiest single power for world peace, social democracy and international brotherhood in the world. We accept India to be our only 'Fatherland'. We look to no other country as our homeland. We have been born and bread up in India and we will live and die as Indian Muslims. In the past and present we have contributed our best 'National-Self' to the making of Indian life and culture and in the future we want to be a free and progressive people in order to contribute our best to the building of a free self-governing and progressive India in the

Political Polity of which Islam must have a place as a free community of culture. We have no use for a system of 'Imperium-in-Imperio'. But equally we cannot allow the freedom and unity of India to mean in practice the political subjection, economic exploitation and cultural submission of the 80 million Indian Muslims who constitute what Sir Bijoy Chand Mahtab aptly terms 'a community an race within a race, a sub-nation within a sub-continent'. The political individuality of the Indian Muslims must be recognised in many (1) schemes of national self-government of Swaraj. That is our political ideal. There is no earthly reason why such an idea should be regarded as incompatible with that of a real creative and catholic Indian Nationalism. If Indian Muslims are guaranteed that position we are ready to become the corner-stone of a free 'Indian Nation-State' (2) This is one the most legitimate and genuine demand from any Muslim leader so far, and as he himself speaks there is no reason why this can not be granted. Here, this person is realistic and genuine; with no ulterior motive whatsoever. As a matter of fact it is surprising that why it took so long a time like 79 years for this matter of fact and genuine demand to surface from the Muslim intellectuals. So far, most of them had been spilling hatred and venom against others, and at times even against themselves. However, this demand did not bear any fruit, as ultimately a Pakistan originated from Indian soil. But then, his happened to be an isolated opinion.

The star of India spoke about the 'Hindu Secret Programme'. They say that the Hindus wanted the Indian freedom all for themselves by depriving the Muslims from enjoying the fruits of the freedom. Then the Star of India warns that "the position and power due to the Muslims as equal partners in this freedom" if not assured, then let the Hindus do not think that they alone can win freedom. (3) Then, "A great menace faces the Muslims and threatens to wipe out their culture. Are they ready – are they preparing to face it?" (4) Further, "As long as the present policy of the Congress lasts, as long as the present mentality the Hindus persists, as long as hypocrisy and deceit continue to play so large a part in Hindu politics, the Muslims would much rather die under the crescent fighting the Tricolour than surrender their birthright, their cultural and national integrity"(5). Words of these type are more than sufficient to fire off any one: appealing to sentiments, culture and religion etc.

Sir. Muhammad Yaqub, a member of the Indian Legislative assembly wrote an article about the Hindu domination. He says: "This is the state when the majority (Hindus) is still almost impotent and without possessing any real power. What will be their behaviour towards the minorities and how they will crush them when the real power comes to their hands can easily be imagined" (6). He says that even in the Assembly which is under the control of the British, the Hindus try to dominate the Muslims. Hence, once India becomes free, and with the Hindus in the majority as a ruling democracy, they are going to crush the Muslims. It is interesting to note what Suresh Chandra Dey speaks of these Muslim intellectual's writings. "this spirit of separatism flourishes under various disguises, and expresses itself in political discussions sometimes as possessing a special importance for the gate keepers of India; sometimes as still capable of carrying on the traditions of imperial rule, sometimes calling in the aid of Pan-Islamism to restore the balance disturbed by Muslim weakness in India The mentality that diverts and deflects national energies from the main current of building up a composite national life in India had its birth a century back" (7). The confusions and uncertainties with the Muslim intellectuals are well spelt out by this write up. All kinds of things right from being guardians of the frontiers of India to the threat

of Pan-Islamism had been spelt out by them from time to time for nearly eighty years now, at times, making the entire affair some thing that of a joke.

'Magna Britannia' written by John Coatman speaks at length of the Indian Muslim problem. "One of the most notable, and yet least remarked, of all the developments in the world politics, within the last two or three decades, is the political renaissance of Islam. Twenty five years ago it seemed as though the last traces of political independence were about to disappear from the Muhammadan world But now a marvellous transformation has taken place. From East to West – from India to Northern Africa – we see new or renascent Muhammadan States, all of them the centre of political ideals and ambitions and some of them the seats of reviving Islamic culture. In a word, Islam is on the march again, and it can hardly be doubted that Islamic countries will play an increasingly important part in world affairs. No serious attention need be paid to any talk of Pan-Islamism, the bogey which at one time shared the stage with the Yellow Peril. A federation – even an alliance – of all or of any important number of Islamic countries is completely out of the question. Yet there are strong invisible bonds of sympathy which link all Muhammadan communities through out the world The Islamic renaissance now in progress across the whole Middle East and north of Africa can be powerfully disruptive factor in international relations and the world order of the future. Although, as we have seen, there is no substance in the talk of Pan-Islamism, there is a very material substance in some of the plans, or at any rate possibilities, of the growth of great Muhammadan States by the union of neighbouring Muhammadan peoples; and further, there is the certainty that such growth will be partly at the expense of non-Muhammadan peoples. One example of the international disorganisation which would be provided by any such development as this world will be provided by the amalgamation of Afghanistan and the Muhammadans of North Western India into one state. Such a project as this may be a chimera, but it is discussed seriously enough by some Muhammadans of standing in both the countries concerned. There are enthusiasts who foresee the rise of a great Muhammadan kingdom, stretching from the eastern borders of Persia to Calcutta, and including Kashmir and some of the Khanates, or little kingdoms, of Turkistan and Central Asia. It is easy enough to point out the tremendous dislocation which would ensue from the realisation of such dreams as this and the permanent insecurity and the certainty of ultimate disaster from the inclusion in such a new state of millions of Hindus, who would form the Hindustan irrendenta"(8).

A very far sighted paragraph indeed. Coatman rightly understands that a Pan-Islamism is an impossibility given the Muslim differential epistemology; but at the same time he is also conscious that the Muhammadans will stick together against non-Muslims. The world shall have definite influence from the Islamic bloc, which happens to be correct; and now it turns into terrorism as a new menace to the entire world. Pan-Islamism had ever remained a dream alone in the minds of the Muslim intellectuals. The point is; there had always been a gap between the intellectuals and the rulers, particularly so in the Islamic world. Every one was for Islam, and every one was depending on Al-Queran. But then there remained differences in perspectives, which is so commonly humane, albeit Al-Queran is not open to interpretations. The existing rulers had always opposed the Pan-Islamic ideas for the fear of their losing power and authority, and this will ever be. Hence Coatman rightly speaks of the impossibility; but he is also much realistic in thinking in terms of some kind of kinship among them. The official kinship among Islamic nations on the

whole shall be nothing unusual and harming any one; perhaps it is only natural; but when such kinship gives rise to more interaction among intellectuals and there emerges negative intellectuals with the epistemology of differences and separatism, then the outcome shall be what we experience today in the form of Jihadi terrorism. As a matter of fact only few individuals are terrorists, but the devastating influence spreads everywhere, particularly so in the younger generations of ardent Muslims. There must be organised effort from international community especially so from the Muslim nations to identify and isolate such sick minds who are normally taking out their frustrations on all others, which also includes other sincere Muslims. Terrorism doesn't exempt any one, even if one is a good Muslim.

The Indian Muslims were divided in their opinion about nationalism and freedom. The primary division was between the nationalist Muslims who were supporters of the Congress and the supporters of separatism. Then, among the separatists, there were further divisions on the basis of sects within Islam. Different Islamic sects held different views even within their separatists' framework of epistemology. For instance, the All India Shia Conference was for separate Muslims nation, but was opposed to the All India Muslim League. But they commonly saw the Indian National Congress party as standing for Hindu nationalism and a Hindu dominated Indian nation. And confusions continued. Al-Aman of Delhi is quoted in the Star of India: "when an old congressman and seasoned nationalist like Mr. Jinnah cannot tolerate the dictatorship of the congress, the generality of Muslims would not be ready to be congress camp followers in hundreds of years". He also says that the congress idea is to establish "despotism and dictatorship of the Congress leaders so that they alone may be enthroned as the absolute masters of the country" (9). What ever might be the accusations Aman is making against the congress, he was absolutely wrong in counting on the majority Muslim support to his views. Such support did not take place. But there were no dearth of efforts to distance the Muslims from the congress from the intellectuals and separatist Muslim organisations. "Muslims, distrusting and despairing of the Hindus, have gone far away from the Congress, and the Hindus, far from trying to collect them together within the Congress fold, have driven the Muslims still farther away, from the Congress by their selfish activities. It is an undeniable fact that Muslims, as a community and as an organised corporate body, are not at all with the Congress" (10). Ansari, another news paper of Delhi wrote: "We have stated it times without number and are still bold to assert that the congress by overlooking the problem of Hindu-Muslim agreement and understanding is committing the greatest blunder which has made the position of all those Congressite Muslims extremely critical who in view of the great objective of India's freedom incite Muslims in general to join the Congress It is a matter of thousand pities that the more these mighty Muslim leaders of Indian nationalism stressed this point the more the Congress diverted away from the objective of a mutual understanding"(11).

It must be noted that all these news papers were trying all out to distance as many Muslims as possible from the Indian National Congress at that point in time, when the 1937 elections were about to be held. The idea was simply to distance as many Indian Muslims from Indian Nationalism and from the Congress; so that the Congress shall not win the elections clean for the other Muslim parties to get control. It had some effects on some Muslims, but it had never achieved the desired goal of distancing Indian Muslims altogether from Indian nationalism. The

Star of India gives it out in explicit terms addressing the Muslim electorates exclusively: "Another week, and the Muslims of Bengal will be providing by their own action whether they wish to live with honour in a land that is theirs by birthright – or to languish in eternal servitude The time has come for every true son of Islam to look deep into his being, to examine the stuff he is made of, and to ask himself whether he will be a saviour or a slaughterer of the greatest community to which he belongs"(12). This indeed was appealing to sentiments (the fallacy of argumentum ad populum) to lure majority of Muslims into the fold of separatist epistemology and far from Indian nationalism. Then the congress party was the only one which stood for Indian nationalism as such, while all Muslim organisations were standing for separate Muslim state and identity. While the political separation of the Muslims from India remained still concealed. There was no one among them to give an open call for this, as every one except Rahmat Ali perhaps, feared the general Muslim reaction to the separatist call. Indian Muslims, still remained Indian Muslims in spite of all these efforts. Time and history had proved these through the actual separation of 1947. But indeed it was a real difficult task for the Indian Muslims not to be carried off through appeals of such stronger sentiments and calls to a separate Dar-ul-Islam.

The separatist Muslim explanation went like this. They said that the Congress nationalism was "nothing more or less than Hinduism", and the Congress party "stands unashamed in the fact that it is an organisation working for a Hindu Raj" (13). People like Sayyid Zakir Ali, (Joint /secretary to the UP Muslim League Parliamentary Board), Mullah Abdus Samad Mukhtadari (Working secretary to the UP Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind) declared that it is against the best interest of the Muslims to join hands with the Congress (14). Sir Muhammad Yaqub said that the Congress is a "purely communal organisation which was aiming at the destruction of Islamic culture, Islamic civilisation, and the separate entity of the Muslims in India". And yet, he says that the Muslims in India are willing "to co-operate and collaborate on terms of equality with any political organisation in the country which aims at the elevation of our status to that of equal partners in the British Commonwealth of Nations by constitutional means"(15). When one looks at the chronicles of that period, one could be bored at the nauseating sight of repetition of the very same idea from many Muslim intellectuals. But there used to be one common fear among them, as to how the Muslim community as a whole is going to take their pleas to separatism. Hence it is a general thing to most of them not to say explicitly what they otherwise would have said. But then there are exceptions to this, some of them did say things without really caring for the popular Muslim sentiments. One such person is one Akbar Kiani, a lawyer from Gujjar Khan in Rawalpindi district, who says that "we are not merely a community but a nation – an integral of the great Islamic fraternity of the world. We want to live in this country not only as Indians, but as good Muslims The Hindu, whether Congressite or otherwise, cannot brook the idea of our loyalty to Islam. Hence only the Muslim who curses his religion in public can remain a true nationalist" (16). The Star of India in their editorial went on to criticise and warn Jawaharlal Nehru for his 'anti-Muslim' stand. The news paper accused him of "deliberately hatching plans not for the good of the Muslim masses but for the complete political domination of the Muslims in India". The paper says that he was a close ally to some people (names are not mentioned) who were "actively and even openly working for the extermination of Islam and Muslims from India"(17). In another editorial of the same paper dated 1st June 1937, says that the Congress and the Muslims have nothing in common and therefore they can not work together at all. (18).

FK Khan Durrani published an article in which he was arguing the case of Muslim nationhood. He also do not give an open call for separatism in a political manner, again for the same fear that how will Indian Muslims take the separatist call. On the contrary, he started speaking of the Muslim fears of uncertainty, fears of Hindu domination, their fear of their religious faith getting endangered, the extinction of Islam religion, etc. Durrani says that the Muslims had become conscious of their “national oneness”, and by now, they possess a “national individuality” of their own. But still, they are at the mercy of several factors albeit the presence of the Muslim League who were trying to do their best, but “after a long study of the Mussalman psychology we have come to realise that their malady lies deeper than can be cured by mere political leaders”. Durrani says that political leaders are by and large opportunists, and therefore, another body is needed for the redemption of the Muslims, which should work revolution in the hearts of men and discipline them spiritually for the attainment of their real ends. The Muslims do not have a sense of direction and a proper goal, and it is due to their entire lack of knowledge of the real purpose of Islam. The Muslim India Society under the leadership of Iqbal was founded with this specific purpose to carry this very knowledge to the Muslim masses. The question of subjugation to non-Muslims is an impossible situation for the Muslims, given the ideology of Islam. Al-Queran “conceives of Muslims only as free and independent and never as subject to people”. All existing political works in the name of and for Islam are merely “ineffective and superficial” and therefore the new body ought to spread the real teachings of Islam to make people conscious and create a new awareness. (19).

It must be seen that among the confusion, now the target had become the Indian National Congress party, juxtaposed to the All India Muslim league as the main opponent and other Muslim organisations as the allies. In August, Mian Ahamad Yar Khan Daulatana, a Punjab Unionist party leader again attacks the Congress. He threatens that if the Congress do not give what is due to the Muslims then it “may very well drive India towards that fatal idea with which certain ultra-communalists on both sides have already made the country familiar – I mean the idea of dividing India into a Muslim India and a Hindu India, a Pakistan in which the Hindus are a subject people and a Hindustan in which Muslims occupy a similar position”. (20) Here, it is interesting to see how deftly he puts the Pakistan idea into force. Apparently he has nothing at all to do with the Pakistan idea, but he says that it may be the case as some ‘ultra-communalists’ (not himself) had been speaking of. The game here is very safe. Should the Indian Muslims reject the Pakistan idea, then it shall be the ‘mistakes’ from the so called ultra-communalists and others are far from it. By any chance if the idea clicks, then all those who want it shall enjoy the ‘fruits’ of the newly founded Pakistan.

And see how cleverly Zafar Ali Khan speaks from the Muslim League Platform in Calcutta. He says that “The Muslims were a distinct, self contained and self sufficient people with their own glorious traditions and distinct civilisation and culture, and they wanted to retain all these attributes of a great Muslim nation intact”. This was only their wish and desire, and they wanted to bring harm to none else. But Britain became the villain to the Muslims, first they ended the Muslims kingdoms, and now, they are about to leave India, and make it a democracy instead of calling the last Muslim rulers to hand over the nation. In democracy, the Hindus shall be the majority and they shall be ruling, the British are not going to ‘return’ the kingdoms to the erstwhile Muslim rulers. This

had become the treachery from the English. "They had been handed over to the tender mercies of the majority community where the rule was that of vote". (21)

Hazrat Mohani, moved a resolution for independence from the Lucknow Muslim League session. He called the Congress "fraudulent and dishonest". He added that Gandhi, Nehru and Malavya "would very soon accept it with thanks for they believed that although it might not bring real independence and freedom for India, it would inaugurate Hindu Raj at the centre as in the provinces and that the entry of the Hindu princes in the Government of India would strengthen the power and position of the Hindus as a whole"(22). Khwaja Hassan Nizami a Muslim spiritual leader wrote to Jinnah saying that the Muslims will have to start new news papers in many languages to counter the Congress menace. "As the Congress has begun an All India campaign against the Muslim Nationality and the Muslim League, it is now indispensable to start daily papers in English, Urdu and Hindi."(23)

Finally, the British were seeing the impossibility of a federal arrangement for the Muslims. On the one hand the Hindus were in opposition to it, and now, many Muslims were also becoming against such an arrangement. The secretary to the state for India wrote to the Viceroy "..... if one thing is certain it is that the Muslims are united in their determination not to be dominated by the Hindus in any form of Central Government which may come into being"(24). He also adds later that "the strongest opposition" to the federal scheme would be coming from the Muslims. (25) The much time spent federation had become ultimately nothing. The congress was against it right from the beginning; the Hindu organisations opposed it with tooth and nail. Initially the Muslim leadership agreed to a federation with the view that it is going to give 'considerable' autonomy for the Muslims, but later they also backed out from the proposal. Though the Muslim intellectuals and leadership of various organisations now started opposing a federal system of Indian Union, they could not give any alternative to it at least in explicit terms. Most of them still went around beating around the bush; but the separatist ideology remained at the back of the opposition to a federal system. Muslims wanted a Pakistan, most of the negative intellectuals wanted a Pakistan, and the Muslims were becoming polarised on this account. Some secretly wished for Pakistan, and many still stood with the Congress and Indian nationalism. The majority of Muslim community seems to have been for the Indian nationalist ideas; in spite of the Muslim League factor. This became a great problem as well as difficulty for the separatist intellectuals, each of them were not sure of support from the general masses: and thus the Pakistan idea remained implicit and un exposed officially by any one. In fact most of the Muslim leadership wanted to use the Pakistan idea as a bogey to get maximum for the Muslim community, and to this extent it received much support. Even Muhammad Ali Jinnah did not really expect the Pakistan to be a reality, he was using it personally against Nehru and then as a bargain with the Congress. Till this time, the Pakistan idea remained a distant dream and an impossibility with hardly any one really wanting it.

During this period, Muhammad Ali Jinnah kept receiving so many letters from people all over. Muhammad Iqbal also wrote several letters to Jinnah. It will be worthwhile scanning through the letters Iqbal wrote to Jinnah to get a grip of certain aspects among the confusion and uncertainty prevailing among the Muslim leadership, though it was less among the Muslim separatist intellectuals. Iqbal had written several letters to Jinnah between March and August of 1937, and these letters did not get published for a long time. Hence the contents of these letters remained

private for a long time, known perhaps only to Jinnah himself, and perhaps to some close friends of Iqbal with whom he might have discussed them. Though Iqbal kept the Muslim identity distinct, there was no idea of a separate Pakistan in him. Most likely he wanted more autonomy for the Muslims primarily from the fear of an impending Hindu subjugation of the Muslims. His ideas went on these lines therefore. In the letter of the 20th March 1937, Iqbal speaks of Indian Muslims as a “distinct political unit in the country”. Speaking about the arrangement of the federal constitution, on 1st April 1937 he wrote “I believe that you are also aware that the new constitution has at least brought a unique opportunity to Indian Muslims for self-organisation in view of the future political developments both in India and Muslim Asia”. He favours Muslim co-operation with “progressive” forces. He says that “while we are ready to co-operate with other progressive parties in the country, we must not ignore the fact that the whole future of Islam as a moral and political force in Asia rests very largely on a complete organisation of Indian Muslims”. Then he is found making reference to the speech made by Jawaharlal Nehru in the All India National convention of Delhi by the Congress. He advises Jinnah that “I therefore suggest that an effective reply should be given to the All-India National convention. You should immediately hold an All India National Convention of the Muslims in Delhi to which you should invite members of the new provincial assemblies as well as other prominent Muslim leaders. To this convention you must re-state as clearly and strongly as possible the political objective of the Indian Muslims as a distinct political unit in the country”. Nehru made the comments of a reductionism saying that Hindu Muslim problem is nothing but a rivalry for jobs, and the real issue in India was not communal but economic. Iqbal was naturally angry and disappointed with the short sights of Nehru, and in frustration of such short-sights and impulses from a national leader like Nehru asks Jinnah to emphasise cultural problem. “It is absolutely necessary to tell the world both out side and inside India that the economic problem is not the only problem in the country. From the Muslim point of view the cultural problem is of much greater consequence to most Indian Muslims. At any rate it is not less important than the economic problem”. The convention should be such that it “would further make it clear to the Hindus that no political device, however subtle, can make the Indian Muslim lose sight of his cultural identity”(26).

Some of the Pakistani historians later interpreted some of these letters of Iqbal as suggestive of a separate Pakistan. As a matter of fact, it can not be easily stated that Iqbal asked for a separate Muslims land in the sense of a Pakistan. Undoubtedly he speaks about Muslim states, and states he uses with small ‘s’. In all probability, he was for more autonomy for the Muslims within India, and this is consistent with his earlier writings and speeches. It had been convenient to the Historians of later Pakistan to put the blessing (blame) of a Pakistan demand on Iqbal, and so they went ahead with it to make the official doctrine. His letter of the 28th May, 1937 is the one from which these interpretations takes wings off. Iqbal, then aging, was unhappy and worried about the poor economic conditions in which the Muslims lived. He realised that all efforts so far had done nothing much to improve their living conditions. He expresses his concern to Jinnah in the following words: “I have no doubt that you fully realise the gravity of the situation as far as the Muslim India is concerned. The League will have to finally decide whether it will remain a body representing the upper classes of Indian Muslims or Muslim masses who have so far, with good reason, taken no interest in it. Personally I believe that a political organisation which gives no promise of improving the lot of the average Muslim can not attract our masses”. Iqbal expresses

his regrets on this count saying that “our political institutions have never thought of improving the lot of Muslims generally”, and, “The problem of bread is becoming more and more acute. The Muslim had begun to feel that he has been going down and down during the last 200 years. Ordinarily he believes that his poverty is due to Hindu money-lending or capitalism. The perception that it is equally due to foreign rule has not yet fully come to him. But it is bound to come. The atheistic socialism of Jawaharlal is not likely to receive much response from the Muslims. The question therefore is: how is it possible to solve the problem of Muslim poverty? And the whole future of the League depends on the League’s activity to solve this question. If the League can give no much promises. I am sure the Muslim masses will remain indifferent to it as before”.

The poet Iqbal, the philanthropic Iqbal becomes much concerned of the well beings of the people of his community here. His concern is what is to be understood here, his genuine concern. On the one hand the Muslim intellectuals had been speaking so much for the Muslims, and supposed to be for the better beings of the Muslims for the past seventy years. On the other hand, political organisations and other organisations had formed to safe guard the interests of the Muslims further. But to what avail? The situation of the Muslims had only deteriorated further and further. In the past the blame could be and was put on the Hindu money-lenders, so that one could argue that the poverty of the Muslims are due to Hindus, since most of the money lenders were Hindus. What is conveniently forgotten here is the fact that a money lender has nothing to do with religion, and he is a money lender to Hindus and Muslims alike and at the same time. It is a misreading here that the poverty of the Muslims is due to Hindu money-lenders, implying that since they are Hindu money-lenders they do not take money back from Hindus, and only from Muslims. But then Iqbal indirectly admits the folly in blaming the Hindus just like that, and blaming the Hindus alone for the poverty of the Muslims, for which the cause if any especially affecting the Muslims in particular distinct from the cause which is generally affecting Indians in general is found. He admits the fact that the Muslims in general are indifferent to no matter what were the calls made by both Muslim organisations and intellectuals.

An important point of difference with the Indian Muslims must be noted here in capital letters. The Indian Muslims were not under any spell of any organisations religious or otherwise, they were a free lot. The danger evolves only when the religious authority assumes control over the common Muslims and start directing them to desired ends. Religious authorities, Maulavis or otherwise, had at times polluted common Muslims clothing desire in the dress of thought to move them as a powerful force. Terrorism is one such out come of this, and the latest. In the absence of the authority of the Maulavis, Indian Muslims could afford to remain aloof from whatever calls made in the name of religion and they could employ their individual reasons. This is the kind of freedom lacking in Muslim countries, where Islam is an official religion and where the Maulavis become supreme some times even above the state.

Most likely, Iqbal never thought in this direction of a religious authority dominating the masses for nefarious ends. A spiritual man as he used to be, he attempts solutions to the problem of the Muslims within religion itself, and philosophically indeed. “Happily there is a solution in the enforcement of law of Islam and its further development in the light of modern ideas. After a long and careful study of Islamic Law I have come to the conclusion that if this system of law is properly understood and applied, at least (27) the right to subsistence is secured to everybody. But the

enforcement and development of Shariat of Islam is impossible in this country without a free Muslim state or states. This has been my honest conviction for many years and I still believe this to be the only way to solve the problem of bread for Muslims as well as to secure a peaceful India. If such a thing is impossible in India the only other alternative is a civil war which as a matter of fact have been going on for some time in the shape of Hindu Muslim riots. I fear that in certain parts of the country, e.g., NW India, Palestine may be repeated". Towards the end of the letter he says: "But as I have said above in order to make it possible for Muslim India to solve these problems it is necessary to redistribute the country and to provide one or More Muslim states with absolute majorities. Don't you think that the time for such a demand has already arrived Muslim India hopes that at this serious juncture your genius will discover some way out of our present difficulties."(28)

Here it is evident that as a solution to the poverty of Muslims Iqbal is not demanding for a Pakistan. He is only supporting a federal system with considerable autonomy for the Muslims where even the Shariat Law could be made possible for the Muslims. It is in Muslim Shariat that he places the solution for the poverty of the Muslim masses, which in all possibilities, is simply a romantic dream of a poet. His religious faith does not permit him to take resort in communism, and at one point he becomes even critical of Nehru's socialistic bent which is a result from the influences of the erstwhile USSR. Finding no other alternative to the poverty problem of the Muslims, he resorts to his religion, which, in fact, suggests many measures to this effect, which again, to what extent could be actually put to practice has never been demonstrated through the existence of any official Islamic nation till date.

The next letter was written in the context of on going Hindu Muslim riots, on the 21st of June, 1937. He was indicating the darker side of the communal riots between Hindus and Muslims. He speaks of it as "storm which is coming to North-west India, and perhaps to the whole of India". Further, "I tell you that we are actually living in a state of civil war which, but for the Police and Military, would become universal in no time". Then he narrates some incidents of the communal riots, and went on to explain: "I have carefully studied the whole situation and believe that the real cause of these events is neither religious nor economic. It is purely political, i.e., the desire of the Sikhs and Hindus to intimidate Muslims even in the majority provinces. And the new constitution is such that even in the Muslim majority provinces, the Muslims are made entirely dependent on non-Muslims. The result is that the Muslim ministry can take no proper action and are even driven to do injustice to Muslims partly to please those on whom they depend, and partly to show that they are absolutely impartial. Thus it is clear that we have our specific reasons to reject this constitution. It seems to me that the new constitution is devised only to placate the Hindus I have no doubt in my mind that this constitution is calculated to do infinite harm to the Indian Muslims. Apart from this it is no solution of the economic problems which is so acute among the Muslims". Obviously, this is the most unhappy Iqbal we see here. His concern is entirely of the Muslims and no one else. May be it is so common like that with many, that he too sees that the Sikhs and the Hindus are entirely at fault and the Muslims are not at all at fault. All the blame is put to one side, and the other side is entirely made innocent. Iqbal is found changing positions here, and he spells out his scepticism about the federal system even. Earlier, he was in appreciation about the communal awards earmarked only for the Muslims, but here he goes against that also. "The only

thing that the communal award grants to the Muslims is the recognition of their political existence in India. But such a recognition granted to a people whom this constitution does not and cannot help solving their problem of poverty can be of no value to them. The congress president has denied the political existence of the Muslims in no unmistakable terms. The other Hindu political body, i.e., the Maha Sabha, whom I regard as the real representative of the masses of the Hindus, has declared more than once that a united Hindu-Muslim nation is impossible in India. In these circumstances it is obvious that the only way to peaceful India is a redistribution of the country on the lines of racial, religious and linguistic affinities. Many British statesmen also realise this, and the Hindu Muslim riots which are rapidly coming in the wake of this constitution are sure further to open their eyes to the real situation in the country Some Muslims in the Punjab are already suggesting the holding of a North-West Indian Muslim Conference, and the idea is rapidly spreading.”

Iqbal's frustration manifests in these words. Albeit it is a luminous fact that poverty about which Iqbal is so conscious is not an exclusive Muslims phenomenon, he is deliberately not concerned about the poverty among the Hindus. It would have been ideal to look at the poor people as poor people instead of making distinctions among them as Hindus or Muslims, and then making special grants for the Muslims alone in the name of the Communal award. When people inherit poverty on the same place, some money is given only to the Muslims; the Hindus become alienated even from the 'privilege' of their poverty! These things go on when actually none among the poor are so concerned about the intellectuals' theories and the leaders' programmes of elevating the poor. That is where we heard earlier a criticism about the Muslim League party, as to whether or not it is for the entire Muslims of India, since, as a matter of fact, it had ever remained a forum for the elites and the educated, not one factor alone would have helped; one had to be both rich and educated to be accepted among the leadership. Jinnah was against the formations of many Muslims conferences as he knew that they will all be functioning claiming autonomy and giving importance to individual preferences. So he was not in support of another new Muslim conference for the Punjabis. But Iqbal, being a Punjabi himself, wanted such a conference to take shape. “I agree with you, however, that our community is not yet sufficiently organised and disciplined and perhaps the time for holding such a conference is not yet ripe. But I feel that it would be highly advisable for you to indicate in your address at least the line of action that the Muslims of North-West India would be finally driven to take.” Then he speaks of the solution to this as he finds it:

“To my mind the new constitution with its idea of a single Indian federation is completely hopeless. A separate federation of Muslim provinces, reformed on the lines I have suggested above, is the only course by which we can secure a peaceful India and save Muslims from the domination of non-Muslims. Why should not the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal be considered as nations entitled to self-determination just as other nations in India and out side India are?” He was only speaking about the Muslims of Punjab and adjacent areas in particular with a passing remark on Bengal. He was not really concerned about the other Muslims in India. In a way, the other Muslims are left to their fates, or to what ever they could do against the projected fury of the non-Muslim domination. “Personally I think that the Muslims of North West and Bengal ought at present to ignore Muslim minority provinces. This is the best course to adopt in the interests of both Muslim majority and minority provinces. It will therefore be better to hold the coming session of the

League in the Punjab, and not in a Muslim minority province.”(29). He repeats this very same idea in his next letter sent on the 11th of August, “Events have made it abundantly clear that the league ought to concentrate all its activities on the North-West Indian Musalmans.” (30).

Even Iqbal himself is much confused. On the one hand he is unable to see the Hindu Muslim riots through an unbiased mind. He is finding only the Sikhs and Hindus as responsible for the communal riots as though the Muslims have no hands in it. Generally, Hindu Muslim riots originate in a pattern: it usually begins with killing of a cow by the Muslims and exhibiting it to the Hindus. Though this is the normal case, it is totally wrong to blame the Sikhs and Hindus alone for communal clashes. On the other hand, he looks at poverty as an exclusive Muslim phenomenon, as if the Hindus do not suffer from the same. His attitude could be seen as protecting the Muslims at the cost of the non-Muslims in India, no matter whatever might happen to the non-Muslims, the Muslims must be taken care of. The immediate experience of Hindu-Muslim riots made him further confused, and he starts blaming non-Muslims for everything. Initially he was much pleased with the arrangements of a federal system and was under the impression that such an arrangement will give safe guard to the Muslim interests. Later, he becomes sceptical of even this and doesn't know what to do. His interests and concerns also narrow down considerably to Punjab alone, leaving others to their own fate. He mixes up everything together to estimate the Muslim problem. At times he says that all the problems of the Muslims are due to poverty, and some other times he says that it is all political alone, neither religion and nor economy. Sometimes he is happy with the federal system, and at the same time accuses the congress as a Hindu party. He was particular in attacking Nehru, whom he also accuses like many others of playing communal politics, though he had nothing to do with the Hindu Maha Sabha, which is supposed to be the official organ for the Hindus. Iqbal is right in speaking about Nehru many times, as Nehru had no hesitations in both insulting and alienating the Muslims, and Jinnah in person. Over and above, the repetition of Hindu Muslim clashes also added fuel to fire. Nonetheless, Iqbal could not and did not suggest any alternative to the federal constitution, about which now every one had formed antagonistic notions. He is unhappy with it, but at the same time doesn't also know what to do next. Muslim interests must be protected; Muslim Shariat Law might do the trick of equally distributing material wealth and property, but how to go about doing these things? There was no answer. Hindus must be kept at distance from dominating the Muslims, and again, How to go about doing this; there was no clear idea at all. Many said that the congress is a Hindu organisation. To what extent this was correct? No clear answer again. Undoubtedly Nehru used to be very whimsical; but shall that mean that the congress is against the Muslims and for Hindus? A question that they should have thought of then.

A resurgence, resurrection of the erstwhile Mughal rule was perhaps the thing in the minds of many Muslim intellectuals. The attempts to recapture this were desperate. The hopes of a Muslim king ruling India had been destroyed. The Muslims wanted a lions share from India, and now they wanted at least to be equals with Hindus. Equal rights in everything and equal representation of people, and equal opportunity in the rule. Unfortunately, the principles of democracy had been different, and this could not be made possible. Hence the thoughts towards separate areas for the Muslims and federation; and now that too are becoming impossible from both the sides, Hindus and Muslims alike. Re-establishment of a Muslim rule as they were ruling India for some years

prior to the coming of the British was the logic behind this Muslim aspiration of Muslim rule in India. When the British came, a good area used to be under Muslim rule, from whom they slowly took the reigns: and therefore; when the British leaves, those areas must be returned to the erstwhile rulers, the Muslim kings. Their going back in history stops with the establishment of Muslim rule in India, but the Hindus shall go back in time little more than that. The Muslim rule in India was established after when the invading Muslims defeated the Hindu kings. The Hindus were the original rulers of India and this land essentially belonged to the Hindus, Muslims came in as invaders only from out side of India. India was subjugated first by the Muslims and then by the Europeans, the British being the foremost ones. With the awakening of nationalism, the Hindus should have wanted the rules of Hindu kings had they been thinking in the lines of the Muslims, but I do not think that any of the Hindus went making such a demand. They were happy with the option of democracy; and as a matter of fact; democracy was nothing new to ancient Indians. Even the so called Hindu 'monarchs' were not so monarchical, they used to have the bearing of both *Dharma* as well as *Saṁskāra* upon them, and a kind of Parliament to discuss things. Perhaps the Hindus were conscious that since they are in a majority in most parts of India they do not have to be afraid of a Muslim domination, and perhaps this could be read as one reason for the Hindus to be comfortable with the idea of democracy. Nonetheless, there still did not surface a demand for separate Pakistan even with all these confusions and chaos in the minds of the Muslim intellectuals. Things still remained uncertain, and very lucid.

Enthusiasm with the idea of federalism had been lost and there is no alternative in sight. Iqbal also made a U turn as to the ideas of federalism, now he is desperate in the future as well as workability with federal constitution. Still, in none of his letters he makes a mention of Rahmat Ali and his out right rejection of this very idea right in the beginning. As a matter of fact Rahmat Ali went around literally begging the Muslim leaders not to give into the ideas of a federal constitution and he openly stated that it is going to be big treachery. Iqbal knew all these, and yet he did not even make a passing remark on Rahmat Ali. Why? But in many of his letters, the influence of Rahmat Ali and his Pak-Stan demand is so conspicuous; one can find the very ideas of Rahmat Ali getting repeated not only through Iqbal, but also through Jinnah himself. Yet, there was no mention of him. Iqbal's rejection of the federation clearly bears the stamp of Rahmat Ali. He was now mentioning the points already covered by Rahmat Ali only. His mention of Muslims as a nation in the Punjab and NWFP etc. is a repetition of Rahmat Ali's ideas. His mention of the Bengali Muslims as yet another Muslim unit too is not different. His new idea of several nations in India is also directly borrowed from Rahmat Ali, and the way Iqbal looks at the other Muslims of India who do not form a majority in their respective areas also is an idea simply borrowed from Rahmat Ali.

Iqbal died in April, 1938. He was unwell for quite some time, and he had to use scribes to make his writings possible. His papers were left with his then associates and his son was too young to understand the importance of his papers. Though Jinnah had kept the letters of Iqbal, he did not make copies of his replies to Iqbal. On the other hand, Iqbal also did not or could not preserve Jinnah's replies among many others of his papers. As it was told, he was unwell, and had to depend on associates and scribes. By this time, the ailing and dying Iqbal is seen to be placing much trust and importance on Muhammad Ali Jinnah. The poet, who himself was a legend in his

own merits is later seen as making several requests to Jinnah, who probably had rejected all of his demands. Iqbal goes to the extent of saying that “.....you are the only Indian Muslim today to whom the community has a right to look up for safe guidance through the storm which is coming”.(31). Then he says that “Muslim India hopes that at this serious juncture your genius will discover some way out of our present difficulties”(32). It is not the case that Jinnah had a good hold over the Indian Muslims or Jinnah was in any rate a better intellect than that of Iqbal. Jinnah had no much support from many Muslims leaders, and his Muslim League party did very poorly in the elections. Jinnah returned to India and into Muslim League politics in 1934 after winding up his law practice in London, and some of the Pakistani historians wants to say that it is Iqbal who forced Jinnah to come back to the then Indian politics. This has no evidence at all, and most probably it is a passing fancy of Pakistani historians in independent Pakistan. KK Aziz rejects this Iqbal forcing Jinnah idea completely. (33) It is true that Iqbal had lauded Jinnah and even started depending on him. Jinnah was another Jawaharlal Nehru, not really caring for common people. They both were of ‘noble’ origins and rich: they both were aristocrats. Jinnah and Nehru; both are commonly used to live and be among the elites and aristocrats, Jinnah was even against giving memberships in the Congress to those who were below matriculation level. His organisation also had to be aristocratic; his mingling with people also had to be aristocratic. Nehru too was just like Jinnah, but two swords can not stay in the same sheath. It is here that both Nehru and Jinnah becoming Hindu and Muslim, both now try to use the communal card for their own personal advantage. At some point, Jinnah became fed up with the Jawaharlal Nehru affair, fed up with the attitude of Gandhi that of Motilal’s son, and left Indian politics to go back to England and continue to practice Law. But then, this strange thing happened as cited by MP Ajithkumar. I quote him: “Jinnah was an ambitious man who confined himself to an exclusive and affluent way of life. As one who came from the upper class he had least consideration and affection for the common man. He even thought it undesirable to give membership in the congress to those below matriculation level of studies. He was by all means a political aristocrat, proud, arrogant and uncompromising in his views and convictions. In matters of personal dignity and pride Jinnah would not tolerate even the slightest humiliation and negligence. (Here the author narrates an incident.). Gandhi’s policy of eliminating anybody whose views he would consider as disagreeable to him from the official chairs of Indian National Congress was a curse to Indian politics. Indeed the way in which Gandhi gave undue weightage to Nehru and others jarred on Jinnah’s sense of pride. This policy of Gandhi-Nehru group frustrated Jinnah so much that he almost called off his political activities in India. Speaking to Louis Fisher, Jinnah once said that owing to the disappointment, he had on account of this decided to stay in England. He did not even go back to India to sell his possession, but sold them through an agent and remained in England until 1935. (Louis Fisher). Writing in ‘Memory of Jinnah’ in the London Economist, 17th September, 1949, a correspondent who knew Jinnah well, stated that while Jinnah was practicing Law at London, some one reported to him that Nehru, whom he despised and hated had imprudently said at a private diner party that “Jinnah was finished”. An ‘outraged Jinnah packed up and sailed back to India at once to ‘show Nehru’ To Cleopatra’s nose as a factor in history, one should perhaps add Jinnah’s pride”(34). He further adds: “Thus withdrawn and isolated, Jinnah became arrogant to the point of being discourteous. Having developed contempt and hatred for ‘Mr. Gandhi’, Jinnah zealously guarded his prestige by becoming the undisputed leader of the anti-congress Muslim League”. (35)

Thus the official doctrine of majority of Pakistani historians that Iqbal must have influenced the return of Jinnah from England must have been an addition later, and without any ground. Iqbal started writing to Jinnah much later, and not prior to his return from England. We see Iqbal literally beseeching Jinnah with points and arguments, actually lowering himself from what he is supposed to have been. Jinnah was much younger and late comer to the Muslim politics as compared to Iqbal, who was an established poet, and a PhD from Germany in Philosophy, a veteran so to say. Why he had to stoop to make requests to Jinnah? One reason could be a kind of psychological pick in Jinnah's aristocracy, or more genuinely, it could be from the point that Iqbal knew that his life was almost getting over and he was unable to do something for the suffering Muslim community from poverty. So he must have resorted to make requests to Jinnah who seemed to have been powerful and influential, and potentially capable of solving the problems of the Muslims. However, Jinnah did not heed at all to the requests of Iqbal and did not act in the directions he was suggesting. All those letters written by Iqbal did no good; it had no impact at all on Jinnah. Apparently Jinnah did not even consider Iqbal and his views. After the death of Iqbal, probably Jinnah must have felt guilty or so, he himself took initiative to publish Iqbal's letters to him with his own forward. Jinnah kept Iqbal's letters, but did not keep copies of his own replies to him. Later he tries to find them from Iqbal's papers and fails.

Ajithkumar's suggestion of Jinnah's return is thought provoking. Here, if someone reduces the whole of Indian politics to Nehru Jinnah personal rift, at least for that time, we may not be able to blame him out rightly. Indeed, the Nehru Jinnah personal differences did play some important part in Indian politics then. The personal insult to Jinnah from Nehru and the reaction of Jinnah to 'show Nehru' what Jinnah is, is something to be taken seriously. With that, we see Jinnah suddenly shifting loyalties from the congress and joining hands with the Muslim League to become their foremost leader, and further, then to make the Pakistan demand, borrowing the entire idea from none other than Rahmat Ali. Ajithkumar's suggestions are worth noting. Was the shift in loyalties from congress to anti-congress Muslim League because Jinnah did not find his due place in the congress among Gandhi and Nehru? Was Jinnah being neglected by the congress leadership? Ajithkumar accuses the congress party for this, and he says that India had lost a very capable states man by loosing Jinnah to the Muslim League and a Nationalist to the Muslim separatists.

Though Jinnah undoubtedly turned deaf ear to the letters of Muhammad Iqbal, he changes positions later. Most likely, he too did not want to accept the responsibility of giving an official call for Pakistan from the Muslim League platform, though he did it to really 'show Nehru'. Once this had been done, Jinnah is found taking refuge in Iqbal saying that actually it was Iqbal who had inspired him to give out the Pakistan call. He also places the 'Iqbal idea' of Pakistan in Iqbal's 1930 Presidential address of the Allahabad session of the All India Muslim League. He too seems to have been playing the safe game, especially in the light of the fact that he was not enjoying the support from Majority of Indian Muslims. And then Jinnah goes about publishing Iqbal's letters to him, which at the time of exception, where not cared by him. Now he himself publishes them and with his own forward somewhere between 1943 and 1944, the date is not mentioned. In the forward Jinnah speaks highly of Iqbal and says that he was inspired by the poet. "the invaluable support that I obtained through the sincere efforts and patriotic and selfless activities of many

friends like Sir Muhammad Iqbal, amongst others". Further he adds: "it was a great achievement for Muslim League that its lead came to be acknowledged by both the majority and minority Provinces. Sir Muhammad Iqbal played a very conspicuous part, though at the time not revealed to public, in bringing about this consummation." In his forward, he also gives the desired twist to the impression that the Pakistan idea is originally from Iqbal, and he actually has no part in it. If the Pakistan call ever becomes a fiasco, then Jinnah also can escape the blame from the majority Indian Muslims. "I think these letters are of very great historical importance, particularly those which explain his views in clear and unambiguous terms on the political future of Muslim India. His views were substantially in consonance with my own and had finally led me to the same conclusion as a result of careful examination and study of the constitutional problems facing India, and found expression in due course in In the Lahore resolution". (36) The letters were published somewhere in 1943 – 1944, some time after the Lahore session in which the demand for Pakistan was made by Jinnah. If it was to 'show Nehru', then, later he had to get support for this idea from important people like Iqbal, once he comes out of mere personal aspects of the thoughts. Rahmat Ali was not even mentioned, he was not an important figure any way. But Iqbal was: he already had made his stature, and he was respected. One can only speculate on many points, and it is indeed impossible to make any authentic statement here; which is also obvious.

Even at this point in time, there were others too showing much interest in the Hindu Muslim problems with their suggestions of solutions to it. A Sindhi, namely MH Gazdar wrote to Jinnah on the 10th of July 1937, asking to consider a proposal for a separate Muslim state consisting of the four Muslim majority provinces of North-West India. His letter says that "I would go so far as to suggest a separate federation of the North-West India, viz., Sindh, Baluchistan, the Punjab, and the North Western Frontier Province. Without this I have despaired of any economic, political and educational improvement of Muslim masses of these Provinces." (37) The struggle for power between Muslim League and the Congress was crossing all limits and individual leaders were getting into personality assaults. If this is the kind of things that shall go on in India, then the nation has to suffer, and the only end which is an inevitable one shall be the creation of a Hindu India and a Muslim India: this was the view of one Sayyid Ali Jawwad. He was fed up with the game of politics. None of them were actually concerned of the welfare of anyone except the fact that every one wanted to be important and powerful and possibly to get into the rule when the British eventually goes. The Hindu question and the Muslim question were equally farce, and it was all for the personal interest of the social elites. Sayyid Ali becomes very satirical and says: "An alternative to a friendly settlement of our dispute is the partitioning of India into two parts, namely, Muslim India and Hindu India Let us hope and pray that such a drastic cure of our ills will not have to be resorted to." (38). At last, and at least; here is some one who is sane and sensible; albeit no one ever understood and shall ever understand what he speaks of. Politics, governments, ideology religion and everything becomes merely instrumental in the hands of politically ambitious people, who shall shoot themselves up into fame and power always at the cost of commoners, who work hard to earn their daily bread, while the authorities and rulers never sweat to gather food, but bosses over others. But, there is no escape from this, and no alternatives to this.

FK Khan Durrani was another Muslim leader who thought in the separatist lines. Some where in 1937, either in summer or autumn, he published a 16 page pamphlet from Lahore under the name "the Muslim National Ideal". He followed the line that Indian Muslims are distinct and a separate nation, and through this paper, he was exploring the possibilities available to the Muslims under the conditions prevailed. He considers the case of the Congress Muslims first, those Muslims who stood by congress for the freedom of India, the Muslims who did not give into the view that Muslims are a separate nation. He took the case of the 'Jamiat-ul-Ulema', who wished to co-operate with the congress completely "to join the battle of India's freedom". Durrani thinks that such people "live so utterly divorced from the facts of life that their lead in worldly matters is anything but safe". Further, he says that such people are really not a Muslim community; as "A community is a community only so long as it has a political creed of its own, a goal of its own, a definite purpose of its own, in short, a soul of its own". Thus Durrani wishes to argue that such Muslims who stand for India's freedom along with the congress are really not a community. In another words, Durrani wishes to 'de-Muslimise' such people and also wishes not to call them Muslims at all. India and Indian National Congress are already identified with the Hindu religion, and the nationalism, Hindu nationalism. Durrani says that the Muslims shall find India's freedom their concern if and only if they have a sense that belongs to India. If they think that they do not belong to this nation, then what interest they shall have in the freedom of India? "It means, India is we and we are India, and there is no India beyond ourselves. Our fight for India's freedom can only mean a fight for our own freedom". But here this is not the case. There are many non-Muslims in India, and a fight for the freedom of India is going to be a fight for the freedom for the non-Muslims. Why should the Muslims be interested in such a fight for the freedom of non-Muslims? Thus the Muslims need not participate in the fight for Indian freedom and in the affairs of the congress. "A political community can fight legitimately for its own political progress. If it ignores its own self and fights, Quixote-like, on behalf of others, it is only committing suicide. Are the Muslims of India prepared to commit suicide?"

Durrani identifies congress with Hinduism and the nationalism with communalism, or Hindu nationalism. Then he goes on explaining what Hinduism is to his fellow Muslims. "Hinduism means caste. Hinduism means untouchability. Hinduism means racial exclusiveness. The race has been under the most rigid discipline imaginable for three thousand years of these anti-national and anti-human institutions, and the Hindu is not yet born who could purge his soul of this ancient virus and think nationally." So for the Muslims in India, the primary problem is this "Hinduism", and unless this 'Hinduism' goes from India, the Muslims shall not be able to think and feel that India is theirs. If India is full that of the Muslims, then indeed, this shall be their country, and they shall fight for the freedom of it. Nationally here is to mean, 'Islamly' or 'Muslimly'. Muslims are unable to work with the congress because "the communalism, sly and secret in some, open and blatant in others, of Hindu leaders in and out side the congress". Otherwise, they also could have joined ranks for the battle of India's freedom from the British. Hence the Muslims do not trust or support the pro-congress Muslims. According the principles of Islam, Muslims must be self-conscious and independent, and they should be a separate entity itself. When this separate identity is not maintained, individuality is not maintained, such a nation perishes itself. (39) The Muslims can live and prosper only so long as they remain to the ideal of Islam, the divinely approved idea. They

have lost this, and they can regain their national vigour only if they take hold of that lost ideal again and remain guided by that, and to live in that light.

But then, Durrani also says that he is not against the congress, with all these. "Let it be understood that I am not 'against' the congress. I am only against it in so far as it is against the interests of Islam. India must be freed from foreign domination; the hunger and poverty of the masses must be removed; the country must be put on the way to power and prosperity. To this end co-operation between the Congress and the Muslims is essential. But it must be co-operation and not surrender of one to the other. Trouble arises when the Congress demands surrender It is a demand which the Musalmans are bound to resist, which every Muslim who has any faith in him shall continue to resist to the last. We are not prepared to let others walk over our bodies. But co-operation is neither practicable nor even possible, and nothing can save the Musalmans from being submerged under the Congress avalanche, until and unless they get organised among themselves. Political forces are gathering awful momentum. The mental twilight in which the average Musalman passes his days may hide these forces from his eyes, but can not save him from the calamity that is approaching fast. The time is not far when it will be too late. We shall fall singly wherever we stand, and Islam will be wiped out of this country as it was wiped out from Spain. What are you waiting for? Would you wake when the calamity is already upon you?" (40).

At the time of publishing this pamphlet, Durrani was writing "A Study of Iqbal" and was obviously influenced by Iqbal. There is no indication that he was carrying the influence from Rahmat Ali in any stronger sense, or it would have been the case that with such attitude that of Durrani who despises Hinduism, he could have instantly supported and elaborated on the idea of Rahmat Ali's Pak-Stan. Even with such differences with non-Muslim Indians and the congress, Durrani is not asking for a separate Muslim land. On a normal course it would have been only natural for him to ask for a separate Muslim land, but he is not even mentioning it in spite of his feeling that India must be freed of the non-Muslims. Two things become suggestive here. One, it was the influence of Iqbal that does not enable him to go for Rahmat Ali's Pak-Stan even with his strong Islamic views. Secondly, this also suggests that Iqbal himself had never thought of a separate Muslim nation out of India in spite of many people's contrary opinion. However, Durrani was centring around the Muslim glory and some kind of resurgence to it, and realises that the principal obstruction to that is the Muslims themselves. That is why perhaps he calls those Muslims who are nationalist Indians as 'soul less' people. Nonetheless his hatred to non-Muslims are evidently brought out through these writings. The confusion with him on a final analysis is that he is narrating many things on the one hand, but at the same time is unable to give any solution to the problems he speaks of. The natural solution that he could have given would have been the one Rahmat Ali had spoken of, but there is no mention about it in any manner, implicitly or explicitly. And, for any standards, it shall be non-sense to believe that he was not aware of things as seen by Rahmat Ali, and Rahmat Ali himself too.

Thus the entire 1936 and 1937 continued to be with much confusion in the Muslim thinking and doing. The year 1938 was just a continuation of the ongoing confusions and discussions among the Muslims intellectuals and leaders, the same ideas kept repeating in many ways increasing monotony and desperations among them. There were discontents, fears of Hindu domination, the same old stories, more or less in the same manner, which often times assumed the form of giving

threats to all non-Muslims. But there were only talks and no action, big speeches and nothing of a follow up. Leaders now were not only intellectuals as we saw in the beginning, intellectuals were less and politicians were more for the Muslim community. Most of the talks of the political leaders were irresponsible, from both the sides, an example from the Hindu side being Jawaharlal Nehru himself. The one time intellectual invasion from the Muslim intellectuals now became latent, though carrying powerful influence from the past, having sown the seed of hatred and the epistemology of difference in the minds of many.

On the 29th of January, 1938, 'The Star of India' wrote: "If Muslims wish to live in India as free men, if there is to be a free Islam in a free India, we exhort the leaders of the community to prepare for a fight and to launch such an agitation through out the country as may rouse these Governors to a sense of their duty towards the helpless and betrayed minorities." (41) Things in India were bad; the Hindu Muslim relations had been experiencing tensions, and there were many communal riots. It is not practical to say which side is right or wrong in a communal riot situation; both sides may have reasons, since it is something of a chain reaction often times. But 'The star of India' had been carrying the sword of just one side as they go on writing inflammatory editorials (in today's India, one could be put behind the bars for such inflammatory speeches and writings, inspite of what religion). On 21st February it said "these outrage upon their most cherished sentiments, these denials of fundamental rights, and these acts of organised goondaism, arson and loot" definitely calls for militant action from Muslims against non-Muslims. Thus, "It is the strength of the Muslim faith, Muslim arms and Muslim determination alone – it is the uniting of the eighty million sons and daughters of Islam in one solid phalanx of a defensive Islamic army that can save Islam from the menace of its foe." (42) What a call for battle!

Khwaja Hassan Nizami of Delhi goes a step further. He says that the Muslims do not really need any help from any one, as they now had become self-sufficient. The Muslims had "awakened from their slumber, recognised their strength, and were now fully conscious and self-confident." (43). Muslims do not require any help from any one, neither from the congress, nor from the British. One could say that now Khwaja is up to bullying! Some young men of Lahore formed a society under the name of 'Majlis-i-Pak-stan' taking themselves after Rahmat Ali. This was somewhere in June or July of 1938. In January 1939, they also formed a central body under the name 'Majlis-i-Kabir-i-Pak-Stan'. They opened branches in other towns, they wrote articles, published them and also distributed them. They designed a membership form with a 'map of Pak-Stan', a map as envisaged by Rahmat Ali, atop the form. This map was copied from Rahmat Ali's pamphlet. The membership form contained an oath: "I sympathise with the Pak-Stan movement which aims at separating the provinces of the Punjab, NWFP, Sindh, Kashmir and Baluchistan from India proper and uniting them under a free and independent government. I promise to make all efforts to make the Pak-Stan Movement a success. I am enclosing my annual membership fee of 4 annas for the year 19__ . Please elect me a member of the Majlis. I shall abide by every decision by the central Majlis." (44)

The idea of Pakistan was slowly evolving. The British news papers started talking about the evolution of a 'Pakistan' which is forthcoming. "so serious have these ideological tendencies become in India that many Moslems in the North are again toying with the idea of creating a 'Pakistan' of those provinces in which the Moslems are in majority." (45) The British administration

conceived of a federation on two grounds. On the one hand, they had been seeing the ongoing Hindu Muslim communal riots for which they also are a party through their divide and rule strategy. On the other hand, the European epistemology is that of differences, and they had ever been incapable of perceiving that thread of possible unity among varying Indians, which include languages, region, and now religion too. Apart from these two aspects, they also had no special interest in keeping India as a single unit, should they quit inadvertently. Thus they believed that the best possible solution to the problems as they could perceive shall be a federation on Indian Union. But both the Congress and the Muslims disagreed with the idea of a federation though they themselves could not offer another solution, and both disagreed on entirely different grounds. For the Muslims, a federation is a hegemonic devise to maintain Hindu domination over the Muslims, and for the Congress, it is an attempt to fragment the nation. Muslim League says "This is a much more serious objection than any thing the Congress party brings against Federation, for it means an intensification of that communal bitterness which it was hoped the scheme for unifying India would tend to lessen. Many Moslems, with a view to maintaining the internal sovereignty of the Moslem Provinces, urge a confederation of these provinces as a preliminary step to association with greater Federation of the Act. This theory has given renewed interest to the old proposal of creating a 'Pakistan' of the Moslem Provinces, a proposal that does not ignore the possibilities of linking the Moslem Provinces of Northern India with those Islamic areas which form a belt of peoples of one faith stretching from Saharanpur to Istanbul. The seriousness with which Moslems are now seeking unification against the Hindus may prove to be as great a stumbling block to the inauguration of Federation as will the political objections of the Hindus." (46).

Sir Harry Hodgson sums it up well. He concludes that there is no "accredited Muslim Leader" supporting the idea of Pakistan, in spite of what Jinnah and Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan told him that the Muslims would fight rather than accepting a Hindu Raj. (47) He says: "It is, however, difficult to see on what front and with what weapons they would fight, except it by mutiny in the Army. That does not seem very possible. On the whole one is bound to conclude that the Muslims' bark is likely to prove worse than their bite." And, "Nevertheless while the communal problem remains as bitter as it is now, we must take into account that the establishment of what the Muslims would regard as a Hindu Raj would be fraught with danger. We must also reckon with the possibility that in the long run the unity of India may prove impossible under domestic conditions and that a Muslims North-West may split off and seek its destiny in association with other Muslim countries rather than with South and Central India." (48)

Mian Kafayet Ali, who had been writing under the pseudonym 'A Punjabi', began a movement with supports from Turkey in 1938 under the name 'Silsila-i-Jamiat-i-Vahdat Ummam Islam' which began in Turkey under the patronage of Sayyid Jalil Ahmad Sinyusi at the instance of Mustafa Kamal Ataturk. Later Kafayet Ali presents his own scheme of things as 'Confederacy of India' again writing under the pseudonym 'A Punjabi'. The movement began in Turkey with "one of its aims was to create more Muslim republics in all those parts of the world which are predominantly Muslim, in addition to the Muslim states already functioning." The Silsila proposed to establish ten such Muslim republics through out the world, and out of these ten, three were to be in India. Haidrya Republic in Hyderabad, Muhammadiyya Republic in Bengal and Islamistan Republic in North-West India. (49) The other proposed Republics were, Surya Republic (Syria, Palestine,

Jordan), Sinuysia Republic (Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, Libya), Azarya Republic (Azerbaijan, Daghistan, Crimea), Turanian Republic (Turkistan), Aqsa Republic (Muslim Provinces of China), Barghashia Republic (East Africa) and Java Republic (Java, Sumatra, Borneo). This undoubtedly is a Pan-Islamic plan. Though Kafayet Ali claims the support of Ataturk in this scheme, it remains doubtful whether or not Ataturk supported it. Most likely, Ataturk would not have even tolerated this scheme. The idea of three Muslim republics in India seems to be a direct borrowing from Rahmat Ali. But then, as usual it is the case with most of the Muslim intellectuals in Pakistan, there is no mentioning the name of Rahmat Ali, though people had been borrowing his ideas heavily.

One Jamiluddin Ahmad, a lecturer in English of the Aligarh Muslim University made out a nineteen page pamphlet entitled "Is India one Nation?" and published it towards the end of 1938. This pamphlet was a repetition of the same differential epistemology which reads the differences only and not the commonalities. With such perspectives it is an easy task to argue that India is not and can never be a single unit in any terms, and Jamiluddin does this, precisely, with just one difference that he centres around the Muslim questions. He was addressing the communal riots and Hindu Muslim problems obviously, to say that: "The only way out of the impasse therefore seems to be to divide India into two federations – federation of Muslim majority provinces and states and another of Hindu majority provinces and states. The relations between the two federations should be regulated by a voluntary treaty of alliance as between two sovereign states. There should also be provision for mutual exchange of population and reciprocal safeguards for the minorities living in each federation. The creation of two such federations is quite feasible and would be in the best interests of both Muslims and Hindus."(50)

The propaganda secretary of the All India State Muslim League, Abdus Samad Khan Rajisthani writes a letter, which was published on the 4th of November in The star of India. The contention of his letter was that instead of fighting for a Pakistan, the Muslims must fight for two separate provinces, which will be two federations, namely, the Northern Indian Federation and the Southern Indian federation. The Northern Indian federations would consist of NWFP, Sindh, Punjab, United Provinces, Bihar, Bengal and Assam. This arrangement "would secure supremacy for the Muslims and solve the complicated questions of political, social, linguistic and cultural nature and importance." The second province shall comprise of Bombay, Central Provinces, Madras, Orissa and parts of Bihar. Let this be for the Hindus. He thinks that this is "the only right, rational and acceptable solution for all classes and communities and the different schools of thought." He is confident that "this Federal Division of India will be the most balanced one in the British Empire finding its equilibrium in size and area in the manner of American Federation."(51)

Tarajaman-ul-Quran used to be a journal published in Urdu from Deccan Hyderabad by one Abdul Ala Mawdudi. During November and December of the 1938, he wrote a series of articles concerning the Hindu Muslim problem in his journal. Mawdudi accused the congress that their secularism is a complete farce and democracy which is a majority rule is a baseless ruling system which in India is nothing but the Hindu rule in disguise, and the congress a Hindu henchman. Thus all proposals for solving communal problems are bound to be one sided, and favouring the Hindus, and all are equally coercing the Muslims. The devices like separate electorates, weightage in legislatures, reservation of seats in public services, minority safe guards and composite executives are the methods through which the Muslims believed that they would be better off. But Mawdudi

believes that these things would not work, as all of them shall fall much short of a genuine demand from the Muslims. Contrary to these, Mawdudi makes the following three suggestions:

There ought to be an international federation, a state of federated nations where each nation should be sovereign and would enjoy 'cultural autonomy'. Secondly, the proposals made by Dr. SA Latif in his book named 'Cultural Future of India' must be implemented, and separate autonomous states must be established in different places. Twenty five years of time must be given to the people to exchange themselves between these provinces, and the centre should keep only minimum subjects with them. Thirdly, if these two arrangements do not work, then there should be two separate federations for Hindus and Muslims, with pacts of treaty signed between the two. (52)

From 1938 to 1943 we see four proposals, or programmes or schemes from Dr. Sayyid Abdul Latif came into existence. Dr. Latif was teaching English in Osmania University of Hyderabad Deccan, and to begin with he was not an activist. When he read the autobiography of Jawaharlal Nehru and Nehru's understanding of a Muslim culture, he becomes furious and sets out to travel all over India to meet people to mobilise opinion regarding the idea of a Muslim culture. Nehru was arguing that there is nothing like a distinct Muslim culture in India, what the Muslims claim as a distinct Muslim culture is actually the same as Hindu culture, and therefore, the pleas from the Muslims that their culture must be protected is both baseless and meaningless. (53) Latif takes this as the 'Hindu Thesis' and sets out to travel All India to discuss the matter with important Muslim leaders, during 1936 – 1937 period. He visited Aligarh and the Jamia Millia of Delhi, and presented speeches, emphasising the need of countering the 'Hindu Propaganda'.

He also met Muhammad Iqbal in Delhi, who invited him to go and stay with him in Lahore for some time. Latif went to Lahore and stayed with Iqbal, and they discussed things. Latif told Iqbal that his Allahabad proposal does not solve the Muslim problem, since he is not concerned about other Muslims spread over India including Bengal. The idea of Iqbal to bring north western India into a "single administration" is not going to solve the 'cultural' problem of the Muslims. On the contrary, "a scheme should be devised such as might comprehend the needs of the Muslims not merely of the North-West but of the Muslims of Bengal and Assam where also they were in majority; and comprehend above all the needs of the Muslim minorities so thinly distributed from Delhi, Lucknow, Patna, downwards to Cape Comorin; as also of the Indian Muslim states." After returning from the tour, he founded the 'Muslim Cultural Society'. Most of the members of this were from the intellectuals of Hyderabad, and in August 1937, he inaugurated this society with his inaugural address on 'The Muslim Culture in India'. Through this, he was giving direct answers to Jawaharlal Nehru, and among the audience, Sarojini Naidu as well as Shaukat Ali also were present. "The address made it clear that the culture of Islam was not a culture which attached importance to the mere externalia of life. It was, on the other hand, an expression of the inner forces of Muslim life, and embodied two fundamental laws of human existence – the law of movement, the law of unity, stimulating and welcoming on the one hand every urge for progress and on the other striving to let that urge subserve or advance the cause of unity in life. The abiding or permanent form in which it manifested itself was the law of Islam called the 'Shariyyat' which moulded its followers into a distinct social order with its own problems to solve on its own lines – problems, educational, social, economic, and political, national and international. Indeed, it was a

culture to be preserved as a force for national emancipation, if its intrinsic value could only be properly appreciated by the non-Muslims.”

Jawaharlal Nehru must have offended the Muslim intellectuals by saying that there is nothing like Muslim culture and Hindu culture as separate phenomena, but he was simply speaking the truth, a fact. Nehru, as it is usual with him, had always been loud mouth and offending for those who did not consider him as a great personality. He was also intolerant on many fronts: but this time; what ever he spoke of the distinctness with a Muslim culture within India, he was correct and right. Latif speaks about ‘Shariyyat’ being the source of the Islamic culture. If this premise is accepted, then since Shariyyat being the same code of conduct for all Muslims all over the world, and if Shariyyat is the only source for them, then all Muslims in the entire world, of past, present and also of the future, should have the same, one and only culture. If this be the case, then, to preserve Islamic culture is automatically to preserve the Shariyyat and the religion of Islam, and let no one quarrel here.

But is this really the case? Is this really the case that Shariyyat goes about determining the culture of Muslims all over the world? We should make a distinction here between culture and religion. Culture is that which belongs to the society, land and not to the religion. Undoubtedly, religion carries culture from one to another generation; but within a given society only. When religions, that is proselytising, travels from land to land, which implies from society to society, it can not carry the culture of the former land and society to the latter. It actually shuns the culture, and adopts the culture of the new land, since the people who change faith in the new land can not simply change their culture as they change their faith just like that. Shariyyat, which has the ‘stage settings’ (Wittgenstein) of Arabia, may be able to function within the religious frame of Islam everywhere, but not otherwise. Islam, in every new society, has to recognise the new stage settings at each place to be cognitive about culture, which definitely can not be different from the culture of the land, and indeed of the other people of the same society who belongs to any religion. This seems to be ‘the’ problem with Islam as a religion; this rigidity; and this false consciousness. Christianity is more spread into distant lands than Islam and they had long recognised this phenomenon. Of course there were conflicts between the Portuguese Catholics and the Kerala Catholics (?) when the Portuguese found Christians in the southern Indian state of Kerala who were two thousand years old themselves; but the Christians of Kerala stood for their culture and fought with the European Catholics, just for the sake of their culture. This of course is another history, which is well recorded and maintained; but for the present, I am limited to the present discussion.

There are Muslims indeed all over the world; there are Muslims indeed who abides by the law of the Shariyyat all over the world as a religious law; but it is wrong to say that they all are the same and they do share the same culture. To get this demonstrated, it is enough that one simply looks around; and just uses the common sense perception. As a matter of fact, it was too ambitious for Latif to lay emphasis on Shariyyat for an Islamic culture. Latif, who is a South Indian in essence, shall have more things in common with Sarojini Naidu, a Hindu but a Telugu than Mohammad Iqbal, a Muslim but a Punjabi. This is the kind of cultural differences Latif failed to recognise in his Islamic enthusiasm and Nehru dislike. Hence the entire question of Islamic Culture as a distinct phenomenon begs the question, involving in the fallacy of ‘petetio principii’. This also amounts to bitter self negation, of negating one’s own culture in the anticipation of internalising another

culture. And this is where the Muslim leaders could not be sure of the general Muslim feelings in India, they were hesitant and fearful of making their proposals explicit, and had been lurking behind some one else's shoulders. On the other hand, if you look at the Gandhi, he had absolutely no confusion in giving general calls to the common Indians, both Hindus and Muslims alike to perform impossible tasks like not reacting to the colonial brutalities of persecution at the non-cooperative movement, and amazingly, all Indians, Hindus and Muslims alike, complied to his call with intense discipline. What mediated between Gandhi and common Indians is the culture, which is not a so called culture of a religion, but culture of the land; culture of the society; which is actually the culture of the people, and their ancestry. This is what such Muslim leaders like Latif failed to understand, this is what leaders like Latif had erroneously propagated among the Muslim masses. They gave primacy to religion over culture and misunderstood what culture is. There is no necessary connection between religion and culture, although religion is intimately connected with culture. In a positive manner, they both are supposed to function as complimentary to one another, one supporting the other. But the point here is; there is no necessary connection between religion and culture in such a manner that a particular culture is inseparable with a particular religion and vice versa. Religion indeed is the carrier of culture from one to another generation, with the inbuilt newness and changes in culture and religion as well from time to time, religion is also a preserver of culture within a given space. But, importantly, when religion moves through space; moves from society to society, it always shuns the erstwhile culture and adopts the new culture of the new society, thus remaining dynamic and timely. This is the only way in which any religion becomes acceptable to different societies, different times and so on, and that is precisely how religions survive through both time and space. What happens here with the Muslim intellectuals is a paradox. Again, this is an exclusive problem with the intellectuals alone, which they create as a virus and spread among common people. This is a paradox of reading the available religion to one; from a given knowledge system, society as well as time to the ancient texts of the religion through an effort of going back in time. This process obviously reverses many milestones a society had covered, and often times put the society back in time through a contradiction, a contradiction of not being really able to go back in time, and at the same time alienating people from the milestones they have covered, alienating societies from their achieved knowledge system as well as structure.

When there are such intellectuals in many different societies, no matter how small their numbers may be, there arises a spurious aura of a oneness among them which at once creates the pseudo epistemology that they all are essentially the same society trans time and space. Thus begins the false consciousness of a universal Islamic oneness, which indeed might sound attractive to many. The notions of pan-Islamism have such origins, which is capable of driving emotional nails into the very hearts of common people who do not give much into speculations. Such paradox and contradictions makes followers of such religion people with contradictions, conflict in their minds, who eventually becomes hateful to the 'others', whose hate philosophies manifests into activities of negativisms, and eventually into the phenomenon known as Jihadi Terrorism.

Faith systems can easily be universal, rituals can also be universal at least in principle, but culture can not be universal, ruling out even a logical possibility. All Muslims in the entire world share the same faith, the same rituals, and thus the same religion, but to say that they all have one culture

becomes an anachronism at once. People belonging to different societies do have different culture, and their religion is not going to make them culturally united. The truth must go hard into the minds of the intellectuals that there are different Muslims in the world as a matter of fact, albeit they have the same religion, they are not the same people. People within the same society who belong to different religions do have the same culture, and they do have more things in common than people of their own religions from different societies. The whole phenomenon of Jihadi Terrorism could be reduced to this, and the India from 1857 to 1947, the ninety years becomes a classical case of an experimental laboratory from where the entire world could make observations and read the phenomenon of present day terrorism simply as a text. All Muslims in the world are essentially converted to Islam to begin with, and to contemplate a racial purity and originality like what Rahmat Ali wished to dream shall be nothing short of idiosyncrasy. Jawaharlal Nehru might have been not an intellectual and he might have not read much, but when he touched the point of culture, he was really striking the deep core of the Hindu Muslim problem. And the reaction of Latif demonstrates the Muslim intellectual's wishes as well as dreams to maintain some sort of distinction, in every possible aspect, just because they are Muslims and wish to be distinct.

While Latif was scheming on culture which he confuses profoundly with religion, the Muslim League went on to appoint a committee under the name 'Foreign Committee' to programme in terms of constitutional arrangements for greater security to the Muslims as they were not satisfied with the 1935 Act for the same. One Abdul Haroon of Sindh, who was the chairman of the foreign Committee and also a member of the Muslim League working committee found Latif's cultural project very interesting, and he invited Latif to reach Lahore and give some insights in the matter to the committee. This was done "in order that he might discuss his views with the members of the foreign committee of the Muslim League which was to meet there on the 29th January, 1939". Latif went from Hyderabad to Lahore and presented his views to the committee and the committee requested him "to prepare a scheme under which the goal suggested might be reached by successive stages". (54) Thus Latif prepared another programme and sent it to the Muslim League in March 1939. This was also released to the press simultaneously. (55) After giving the proposal to the Muslim League, Latif had elaborated the ideas into a book under the title "The Muslim Problem in India together with an Alternative Constitution for India", with a forward from Haroon and published it in July from Karachi.

Latif begins this book with the question: "why are the Muslims of India at this moment in a state of serious anxiety over their future?" He then answers the question saying that "in the fact that the Muslims have lost faith in the Hindus and apprehend that the Act of 1935 and anything that may follow on its lines will sooner or later destroy their individuality and reduce them to the position of a helpless minority". He accuses the British that the colonial rulers had "set aside every moral obligation towards them in an anxious desire to placate the Hindu majority". The British had made some fundamental as well as lethal mistakes. They assumed India to be one single nation, "which it is not and does not promise to be". The Hindus and Muslims, who are "the two leading and major nationalities in India" and these two major nationalities within India, are completely "divided into two different social orders drawing direct inspiration in every detail of life from two fundamentally different religions and cultures". Thus the constitution devised by the British was "out of tune with the genius of its people, their history, tradition and social organisation". The new constitution of the

British aims at establishing governments both in the provinces as well as in the centre only of “a single majority nationality”.

Then Latif goes on to establish that the Indian society is not really fit for the western ideas of democracy. He understands that the Indian society which is essentially a Hindu society is based on the caste structure and that alone is the social structure. Thus, the notion of democracy becomes “a direct challenge to the basic principles of the Hindu social structure”. Latif sees caste as “a comprehensive system of life dealing with food, marriage, education, association and worship”, but democracy is not merely a form of government but a “state of society” and a ‘system of social relationships’, which goes against the Hindu structure of society. According to Latif, the Hindu social system is essentially based on inequality of castes, and he wonders as to how democracy become applicable to the Hindus, when the very social structure of the Hindus is based of the structure of caste hierarchy which is a relationship of inequality. But still, the Congress party, according to most of the Muslim leaders is essentially a Hindu nationalist and religious party is vouching for democracy for India: and he tries to understand this through the notion of an attempt to deceive the majority of the Hindus, the masses, who had been under the social domination from the Brahmin caste for a long time. He thinks that this is nothing short of fascism of the Congress party. “Indeed the fascist tendency so clearly noticeable in the high-command of the Congress at the present moment is but a phase, a development of the self-same high caste imperialism which from time immemorial has denied to the Hindu masses their birth right to freedom”. Then he draws a comparison between caste and democracy to say that caste and democracy are “fundamentally opposed in details, contrary in methods, and different in results”. So, albeit the Congress is saying that they are in for democracy, it is really not the case; they are only using the idea of democracy as an ideology to intellectually deceive the low caste Hindu masses only to maintain their hegemony above them through giving an impression that they are for equality for all.

The people of India are not one nation. “India is a congeries of races and cross breeds”. The only way to make this ‘congeries of races and cross breeds’ into one nation is the possibility of a cultural unity; which is not the case with India. Fundamentally the Hindus and Muslims belong to two different and distinct cultures, and even within Hindu religion “a single stable nationality for all the Hindus” is an utter impossibility. Now, if one ventures to speak of a political and economic unity of India, then it is “after all the result of British rule which so many are out to destroy”. Thus, India can not be a united phenomenon for any standards, and to speak of a united India or one India is simply nonsense. (56) Latif was trying to draw a total distinction between the Hindus and the Muslims. He says that it is true that the Hindus and Muslims had been living together for centuries and the only result of these centuries of co-existence is simply “a process of interaction in ways of living materially assisted by a common climate” only. Since ‘culture’ to him is not different from religion, he says that “The blending of two such cultures calls for the blending of the religions themselves which have inspired them”. Latif was drawing a situation, where the Hindus and Muslims just can not go on together, and they have to be essentially separate. (57)

Haroon circulated the book widely in India and Europe among the Muslims and the book received much appreciation from many. It strengthened the Muslim League programme and gave the Muslim intellectuals another spurious Logic to speculate in terms of Muslim separatism, by identifying religion with culture. Later Haroon writes to Latif: “Under the circumstances I must

express my utmost thanks for the labour you undertook for the supreme cause of Musalmans by evolving such a scheme which if materialised embodies in itself the separate and free home lands for the Muslims in India". (58)

During the next year, in 1940, Latif makes some more improvisations to his 1939 proposal in the light of the 1940 Muslim League resolution. There were some problems with Latif. The Lahore resolution of the Muslim League was primarily to make a separate home land for the Muslims of the north and the North-West, leaving out the Deccan, Hyderabad which was a Muslim state. Latif belonged to this region, and he was not prepared to accept the Lahore proposal which was ignoring the Muslims of other area where they were a minority, as envisaged by Rahmat Ali. As a matter of fact, though every one seems to speak for all Muslims of India, they were actually speaking of the Muslim majority regions. Naturally, intellectuals who are training themselves in the epistemology of differences and hate philosophy are bound to end up in such predicament as to find differences in everything that obviously leads them to disintegration. At this point in time, we find in Latif the beginning of separatism among the Muslims who, according to him have the same and one and only culture and theoretically at least will have to be one unit. Latif is asking the league, that who is going to give the mandate for the mandatory safe guards that they are speaking of? Unhappy with the League programme, he asks the League to decide at once the shape and form of the 'All India constitutional Structure' which they are projecting. He says that "A tentative out line of it, as submitted by me, has been under the consideration of the Working Committee for over a year. Some of its features, including the provision of regional sovereign states have, no doubt, been incorporated in the Lahore resolution. But the background for the frame work of an All India constitution has not been reproduced." The question of mandatory safe guards to the Muslims is "of supreme importance to the Muslims of all those provinces where they are in the minority. They are alarmed at the plan envisaged in the Resolution, and therefore to be assured that their position is safe under it, and also shown how it is so."(59)

And thus he revises his early notions of 1939, and calls it "A Broad Outline of the Union of Commonwealth of India" in the light of the Lahore resolution. India has to "resolve herself into a Union with federal form of constitution peculiar to Indian conditions." There must be two types of sovereign states in the federation, one set of those who were in the British rule, and the other those who were not within the British rule like that of his own state. The first category of states, i.e., the ones which were within the British rule, should be "so constituted through a readjustment of existing provincial boundaries as to form a compact bloc affording absolute cultural homogeneity to the majority community inhabiting the areas and cultural autonomy to the minority communities wherever necessary."

Latif was speaking of a three tier federal system, a mixture of provinces and princely states, a weak centre, composite executives, irremovable cabinets, and transfer of population. This time he had also added another thing; the creation of state armies and the right to secession for the federal states. In a word; Latif was becoming more impracticable and increasingly romantic. But it is interesting to note that he had been talking only in terms of a united India, and not in terms of a Pakistan and then India. On the contrary, the Lahore resolution of the All India Muslim League, though had many internal contradictions, stood out distinct as they were clear about the forth

coming of a Pakistan, a separate Muslim nation carving out from India. This was a fundamental difference between the Latif programme and the Lahore session.

Nonetheless, Latif still stood for one India. On the one hand he spoke about the impossibility of two cultures co existing, and on the other hand he did not want the creation of a Pakistan. And the Muslim League was unwilling to accept this idea of Latif in any case. Latif continued to think that the Muslim League would change its mind about Pakistan and kept persisting on his ideas, and kept pressing the Muslim League. But the Muslim League was serious about the Pakistan idea and even made the Pakistan idea as a part of the constitution of the Party during the 1941 session at Madras. And still, Latif went on making attempts to change this, as he argued that the Pakistan idea had alienated the Muslim League from the Congress thus closing all the doors for any possibility of compromise and adjustments. Nawab Nazir Yar Jung speaks about this deadlock; "the deadlock seemed so unresolvable that it seemed to the author (Latif) imperative that some modus operandi should be devised on the basis of each conceding to the other the substance of their respective demands, viz, sense of security and sovereign status to Pakistan areas on the one hand and of political unity to the whole of India on the other." (60)

But Latif did not give up. He was bent on making the contradiction co exist: of combining Muslim sovereignty with Indian unity: and thus he prepared another constitution plan and circulated it to both Congress and Muslim leaders on the 15th of May, 1941. On his covering letter to Jinnah he says " allow me to say that your Madras resolution has saddened some of your best friends, including me. The Pakistan idea has served its purpose; it has aroused the necessary political consciousness among the Muslims. But that consciousness now needs to run into practical channels I may repeat that the Pakistan scheme in its latest form will neither establish Muslim States properly so-called; nor get rid of the Hindu-Muslim-Sikh problem; nor afford any security to the Muslim minorities in the proposed independent Hindu India, unless a wholesale exchange of population is effected, which no one favours. I am not the only person to hold this view. A compromise on the basis of complete separation is unthinkable." (61).

The difficulties that Latif had been experiencing are an implicit one. The Muslim League leaders were mostly from the north of India, and Latif was from the South of India, Hyderabad, Deccan. Muslim Leaders had in their minds the areas of Punjab, Sindh, Baluchistan, NWFP, and the like. Rahmat Ali gives an excellent example to this: with a promise that when the Pakistan becomes a reality the other Muslims from other areas can ever look for support from Pakistan, but (indirectly) they are not welcome to Pakistan. Latif finds himself in similar situation; if Pakistan becomes a reality then he has no option other than to migrate to Pakistan as a refugee which he does not want to do. He had been making tall claims of one culture, and now he himself becomes a victim of the fact that religion can not offer cultural unity; he himself is unable to go to Pakistan and live there leaving Hyderabad. And at the same time, these things were not of much interest to the Muslim leaders and they did not consider the pleas of Latif that Muslim League should not ask for a Pakistan. The epistemology of difference and separatism had been at work: and at the very outset, their evolves different kinds of Muslims just on the basis of geography, let alone other differences which were only forthcoming.

Latif was much remote from the Muslim main stream, which was the north of India. He also did not have much contact with the Muslim leaders of the north, and there were not many leaders from the south. On this account he opposed the Muslim League and criticised Jinnah, which made him unacceptable to the Muslim intellectuals. What is more, he was also not involved in active politics; he remained an arm chair politician only. He also presented the view that ultimately the Congress would be able to give all Muslim demands, but by then Muslim League had already become a Pakistan party and there were no opportunity to any compromise on separation. Thus Latif did not become as popular as he would have wished, and hardly any one even debated his plans. He would definitely have been an ardent supporter of Pakistan, had he been not from the south. Most probably he himself would have found how 'different' he is from the Muslims he had interacted with in the North, Punjab, Sindh, and so on, thus proving his own theory of the unity in culture self stultifying: but he could not have accepted it so.

Reference

1. *sic*.
2. Nawab of Dacca Khwaja Habibullah, *Presidential address, All India Khilafat Congress, Calcutta*, 4th January, 1936, *IAR* 1936, Vol I, p. 306, also in *TSI* 7th January 1936.
3. *TSI, editorial*, 6th January 1936.
4. *TSI, editorial*, 9th April, 1936.
5. *TSI, editorial*, 16th April, 1936.
6. Sir Muhammad Yaqub, '*The Domination of the Majority: Congress Behaviour in the Assembly*', CMG, 13th October, 1936.
7. Suresh Chandra Dey, '*India in Home Polity*', *IAR*, 1936, Vol. I, p. 62.
8. Johan Coatman, *Magna Britannia*, London, 1936, pp. 318 – 322.
9. Al-Aman of Delhi, quoted in *TSI*, 18th January, 1937.
10. Sarfraz of Lucknow, quoted in *TSI*, 18th January, 1937.
11. Ansari of Delhi, quoted in *TSI*, 18th January, 1937.
12. *TSI, editorial*, 11th March, 1937.
13. *TSI editorial*, 20th March, 1937.
14. Quoted in *CMG editorial*, 29th April, 1937.
15. Sir Muhammad Yaqub, '*Statement to the Press*', Bombay, 29th April, 1937, *Ibid*, 30th April, 1937.
16. Akbar Kiani, *letter*, *Ibid*, 30th April, 1937.
17. *TSI, editorial*, 10th May, 1937.
18. *TSI, editorial*, 1st June, 1937.
19. FK Khan Durrani, '*Muslim India Society*', *TSI*, 22nd May, 1937.
20. Ahmad Yar Khan Daulatana, '*Congress Policy and Muslims*', CMG, 7th August, 1937, rep by *TSI*, XVIth September, 1937 under the title '*Congress Communalism and Muslim Minorities*'.
21. Zafar Ali Khan, *Presidential Address*, Calcutta Muslim League Conference, Calcutta, Twenty Sixth of September, in *TSI*, 27th September, 1937.
22. Quoted in M Noman, '*Muslim India*', Allahabad, 1942, p. 353].
23. Khwaja Hassan Nizami to Jinnah, 4th November 1937, Mukhtar Masud (ed), '*Eye Witness of history: A Collection of Letters addressed to Quaid-i-Azam*', Karachi, 1938, p.53.
24. Zetland to Linlithgow, Sixth December 1937, quoted in RJ Moore, '*British Policy and Indian Problem, 193 -1940*' in CH Phillips, (ed), *The partition of India*, London, 1970, p. 84.
25. *Ibid*, p. 83.
26. '*Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah: A Collection of Iqbal's Letters to the Quid-i-Azam conveying his Views on the Political future of Muslim India*', (with a forward by Jinnah himself) Lahore, n.d, letter of the 20th march 1937, pp. 11 – 13. These letters begin on 23rd May 1937 and end on 10th November 1937.
27. *sic*.
28. *Ibid*, Letter of 28th May, 1937, pp14 – 18.
29. *Ibid*, letter of 21st June, 1937, pp. 18 – 23.
30. *Ibid*, letter of 11th August, 1937, pp. 23 – 24.
31. 21st June.
32. 28th May.
33. These assertions are made by '*Struggle for Independence, 1857 to 1947*', Government of Pakistan, Karachi, n.d., p. Sixty one.
34. MP Ajithkumar, *India Pakistan Relations.....*, New Delhi, 200six, pp 44 – 45.
35. *Ibid*, p. 45
36. *Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah*, Jinnah's own forward, pp. 2 – 5

37. MH Gazdar to MA Jinnah, 10th July, 1937, quoted in Lawrence Ziring, '*Jinnah: The Burden of Leadership*', in '*World Scholars on Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah*', ed by AH Dani, Islamabad, 1979, p.40.
38. *The Pioneer*, Sixteenth October, 1937.
39. FK Khan Durrani, '*The Muslim National Ideal*', Lahore, n.d, pp. 1 – 14.
40. *Ibid*, p. 15 – 16.
41. *TSI*, editorial, 29th January, 1938.
42. *Ibid*, editorial, 21st February, 1938.
43. Khwaja Hassan Nizami, *statement from Delhi*, 2nd March, 1938, *TSI*, 7th March, 1938.
44. KK Aziz, p. 415.
45. India correspondent, "*Federation in India: The Princes and the Provinces: An Old Conflict in New Guise*", *The Times*, 5th December, 1938.
46. India correspondence, "*New Factors in India: The Attitude to Federation: Parties and Princes*", *The Star of India*, 21st December, 1938.
47. Sir Harry Hodgson's report, quoted in Kanji Dwaraka Das, "*Ten years to Freedom, 1938 – 1947*", Bombay, 1968, p. 32.
48. *Ibid*, pp. 36 – 37.
49. A Punjabi, '*Separation – A Reply to Its Critics*', Lahore, 1942, p.14 – 16.
50. Jamiluddin Ahmad, '*Is India One Nation?*', Aligarh Muslim University Muslim League Publications No. 6, Aligarh, 1939, reproduced in '*India's Problems for Her Future constitution*', Bombay, n.d, p. 139.
51. Abdus Samad Khan Rajisthani, '*Letter*' *TSI*, 4th November, 1938.
52. *Tarajaman-ul-Quran*, October, November, December, 1938
53. Jawaharlal Nehru, "*An Autobiography with Musings on Recent Events*", London, 1936. Chapter LVI deals with the Hindu Muslim problems.
54. Haji Sir Abdullah Haroon, Introduction to SA Latif, '*The Muslim Problem in India*', Karachi, 1939, p. iii.
55. The full text was published by the Statesman and The Star of India on the 30th of March, 1939.
56. SA Latif, '*The Muslim Problem in India*', Karachi, 1939, p. 10 – 12.
57. *Ibid*, pp. 19 – 22.
58. Abdullah Haroon to SA Latif, 5th January, 1940, '*Nazir Yar Jung*', pp. xxv – xxvi.
59. *Nazir Yar Jung*, op. cit., pp. 68 – 82. A note sent to the foreign committee, without mentioning the date.
60. *Ibid*, p. 101.
61. SA Latif to MA Jinnah, 16th May 1941, *Ibid*, pp. 102 – 103

Chapter -7-

In the mean time, in 1939

In our discussion on the programmes produced by Latif and his predicament, we had gone up to the year 1941 to maintain continuity of Latif's ideas, leaving behind other aspects right beyond 1938. However, we will now return to our chronology and to the times left behind to take closer looks at phenomena beyond 1938. Till date, there was no word about the partition, albeit the Lahore session was just on the way. Still, the old story of Hindu domination possibility ruled the minds of the people. The fear of a Hindu rule remained the theme of all talks during this entire period. The Muslim intellectuals were indeed troubled, they were troubled with the possibility of a democracy coming up where in India, the Muslims are not in any majority to make the forth coming democracy a Muslim rule. The Statesman news paper comments: "at bottom we think what Moslems were resolutely opposed to is a purely democratic constitution based on majority rule"(1). In the mean time, sporadic ideas of Darul Islams kept coming, of course from isolated individuals like Rahmat Ali. Personalities from organisations remained careful enough not to let out the cat; for, there was no predicting as to how the Indian Muslims are going to take such a drastic call for separatism. A Lahore based journalist aired out his view in the lines of creating two Muslim states in the north-west and north-east. To make his ideas formidable, he contemplates into the future of such an endeavour, to say that such 'separate national states' are simply going to thrive; they would be "far stronger numerically than any other existing Muslim state and likely to develop in course of time into first class powers". His logic runs in the following manner: "no true Muslim, however great and tempting the allurements the Congress may offer him, will ever agree to accept the Congress political system and to lose his separate political and religious identity for the sake of a bigger India where Hindu interests will flourish at his expense"(2). Some of the Hindu leadership suggested that separate Muslim provinces may be made to satisfy the age long Muslim demand for separatism and fear of Hindu rule, for instance, Gulshan Rai of Lahore suggested that in the east, Sylhet district, Chittagong, Dacca and Rajshahi could form one Muslim province and in the west, Rawalpindi, Multan, a major portion of Lahore, some portions of Ambala and Jullundhur along the NWFP could form another Muslim province. He views that this could solve the Muslim problem in India. (3)

But then, the Muslims intellectuals were not happy with these suggestions. They projected the fear that once the Muslims were part of India in any way, then they will all cease to be Muslims, and in the interest of protecting their religion, these suggestions shall be unwelcome. Once the Muslims were 'sucked' into Indian nationalism, they would no longer remain Muslims. (4) Thus, there were no compromises at all in sight for any sane man of understanding. A chronicler describes the situation in these words. "The dreams of recovering the reigns of authority in the state in India which had slipped from Muslim hands are in the consciousness of many Muslims, modern-educated Muslims, realities of today, within the grasp of resolute men. It would be foolish for Indian

public men and publicists to shut their eyes to the sinister possibilities of the schemes of federations outlined by Muslim thinkers and public men. These have revived ambitions, provoked particularistic conceits, and stimulated aggressive activities that would result in breaking up the unity and integrity that have been India's from beyond recorded times. Reformers and reactionaries among the leaders of the Muslim community in India appear to be helpless instruments in the hands of forces that are almost elemental in their sweep and violence.”(5)

The ideas of separation still remained unclear, except in the minds of few. It had been the same ideas, in varied forms, which kept being repeated in multi colours from time to time by different Muslim intellectuals for the last seventy years. Yet, no one had made it explicit on behalf of any organisation so far. In spite of all ideologies, the leaders in general remained sceptical of the general attitude of Indian Muslims towards a call for separate home land exclusively for the Muslims when it really comes to practical level. And this scepticism and doubt had been what that kept them back from speaking many things aloud, things those they had been contemplating and processing in the minds of some for the last seventy years. The whole process was put into writing by a commentator in The Times of India in the following manner: “The talk of a confederacy of culturally homogenous units is the direct out come of the community's state of mind. There is little new in it. It is just a revival of an old idea. The name of the late Sir Muhammad Iqbal was at one time associated with the Pakistan scheme as it was called. The idea is to carve out for the Muslims regional units in which they will be masters of themselves, free to develop their cultural inheritance. Virtually it amounts to a secession of Muslims from present-day India and their formation into autonomous units willing to work together with similar independent Hindu units for common purposes There is, however, little support for the scheme at the moment outside the Muslim League leaders. It is still in an academic stage, as far as the Muslim leaders are concerned, while others describe it as fantastic, unpatriotic, extra-territorial in out look and so on”(6).

The news papers of the time kept printing so many views on the Muslim issue. Perhaps no other issue had remained in the headlines for this long time anywhere in the world at any point in time. There were discussions, speeches, articles written and so on and so forth. The Star of India published an article by a Muslim student leader under the title ‘Pakistan The Only Solution’, in which the student leader argued that “a division of India is now the only means left for the Muslim community to live an honourable life in this country where they were rulers for eight centuries.” (7) In general, first the Muslim intellectuals and after the formation of the Muslim League their leaders had been constantly spreading the fear among Muslims about the intentions of the Indian National Congress and MK Gandhi, Nehru and such leaders. Over the years they had been repeating the idea that the Hindus are going only for a Hindu Raj where Muslims can only be slaves. Thus, once the British withdraw, the Congress shall become the majority party in the democratic rule, and the Congress will establish only a Hindu rule in India. But then, under such circumstances, the common Muslims remained ever confused as usual. They did not know who to trust: the Congress and Gandhi or the Muslim leaders' words against the Congress. On the one hand whatever the Congress were speaking were rather objective for any one to perceive, and on the other hand what the Muslim leaders were speaking were speculations about an impending Hindu rule. Can it be so? Will it really be the case that Gandhi and others are Hindu fundamentalists who are trying

to deceive the Muslims? Such must have been the states of confusions in the minds of common Muslims. Yet a common fear: will our religion go from us could have also been with most of them. Situations continued to be uncertain for all, the Hindus and Muslims alike.

The English man, HV Hodson who had played an important role behind the curtain in all constitutional reforms in India during these years thinks aloud of the Muslim predicament. In the May issue of the 'Fortnightly Review' he wrote that if the Congress dominated the federal centre as the Muslims fear 'aloud', then the Muslims would see "looming ahead that rule of the Congress which the Muslim League stalwarts identify with the detested 'Hindu Raj'." Muslims say that they will fight such a possibility of a Hindu Raj tooth and nails; but then it was not the feeling of all Muslims alike. They speak of fighting it, but how to go about fighting it, they were not clear at all. Hodson goes on: "If physical fighting is to be understood, then the Muslims might do any of three things: they might incite the Muslims in the army to mutiny, or they might stage a general armed uprising among the Muslim population of northern India, or they might plot with tribesmen beyond north-west frontier or with foreign powers to let down the barriers against the invader (the third alternative would obviously imply the first also). It is extremely doubtful whether the Muslims are determined enough or desperate enough or well enough organised to attempt any of these methods, though they might perhaps invoke sporadic and isolated outbreaks of trouble. Nor is it out of the question that when the Hindu Raj was once established, and British power had melted away from India's internal affairs, the Muslim areas in the north-west might attempt a forcible secession from the federal state. Indeed to the minds of some people this used to be highly probable." (8)

The then Viceroy did not give much importance to all the threats from the Muslims on whatever grounds. He saw it only as the problem of some Muslim intellectuals and not that of the Muslim community in general. He believed that majority of the Muslims would be prudent and sensible, not to get lead by the handful of separatist intellectuals. In his letter to the Secretary to the State of India written on the 19th of May, 1939, he gave the view that what ever might the Muslim intellectuals be speaking of; the Muslims in general will join the federation with out many difficulties. But the secretary to the State, Zetland held different views from that of the Viceroy. He says that "I found the Viceroy's view, that the Muslims were in no position to torpedo the Federation scheme, not a little surprising. This was in fact the one major issue on which through out our association as Viceroy and Secretary of State our judgement was at variance." (9) The reply what Zetland made to the Viceroy on the 27th of June speaks of an impossibility of the viceroy's convictions. (10) He says that they can not force the Muslim provinces to join the federation if they do not want to do so, and most likely NWFP, Punjab Sindh and such places will refuse to join the proposed federation. In a way, he gives a kind of warning to the Viceroy that if some are not determined to join the federation, then they can not do any thing against that, which is going to be an administrative problem for the British rule in India.

In the mean time, a Pakistan association was formed at Lahore. Whether the association wanted a Pakistan as a separate nation or not is not sure; most likely some at the association wanted a separate Muslim nation like a Darul Islam, but the point is there was no one speaking about it or demanding a separate Pakistan in explicit terms. Even this association had the fear, whether they and their demand for a separate nation if put forward will be accepted by the general Muslims

apart from the intellectuals? Their inability to make the demand public and explicit rested with these phenomena. In the month of May, 1939, the Pakistan association of Lahore made a demand for a separate federation for the Muslims, but not a separate nation. (11) A demand, somewhere near sounding separation came from a column writer of *The Statesman* on the 16th of June. Signed by the pseudonym, the writer says "The Moslem League is pledged to secure the Moslems the fullest protection for their political, cultural and religious rights. If in an 'independent' India, with the British out of the picture, those rights are in jeopardy, Moslems can not regard it as independence but worse bondage than the domination of 'imperialist' Britain. Such independence the Moslem League is bound to oppose." (12) Now how this opposing shall go about, he is unable to mention, and what Muslims ought to do also remains as an open question still.

Though it was the year 1939, there was no word out for a separate nation or of a partition. As I mentioned many times before, there were no one to 'bell the cat', and all leaders and people in public sphere continued grouping in uncertainty about the general Muslim public feelings and opinion. One could say that in spite of all writings and propaganda of an impending Hindu rule, the Muslims in general did not wish to be a separate nation from India. So many decades of variant works to mobilise the general Muslim opinion towards a partition has not found any promising results at all, and this made any sensible leader who feared of losing his stand not to speak of separation in explicit terms. Nonetheless, they all could easily speak of one thing, of 'protecting' the rights of the Muslims in all changed situations, British or Hindus, which was a generally accepted view for most of the Muslims. And, as yet, they did not doubt a Hindu rule in serious terms, and the Muslims still believed Hindus: in spite of everything. But then, the silence about partition in the year 1939 does not mean that there was peace: the apparent peace at the surface level was that of a volcano indeed, which could burst into flames any time. The Muslim intellectuals' efforts towards separatism which started nearly eighty years before had been consistently at work for nearly a century, which became more intense in 1939 through a century's desperation. The intellectuals and leaders were at tremendous work to push the partition idea in to the minds of the people, day in and day out. In the initial days, it used to be just the work of the Muslim intellectuals, and now, the Muslims had formed political party and other Muslim groups, and there are many public figures. The intellectuals are to play the behind the curtain role only by this time, public figures could be more aggressively active. The year 1939 was witnessing all out efforts from many quarters to get the minds of the majority of Muslims moving in this desired direction, or at least to some point where the noticeable majority of Muslims not coming out to the streets with opposition if a separate nation demand was put in public. They kept working to this goal though all remained apparently as usual at the surface level. On the one hand, the point that there is a Hindu Muslim problem had already been driven into many people's mind. Though there were many others who considered this to be arbitrary and spurious, there were also many who considered the Hindu Muslim problem to be a genuine one. As solution to this problem, many programmes and schemes were put into the air already. By the year 1939, such schemes and programmes were on the increase, from many quarters. Though the Muslim League had not made out any plan or programme to this effect officially, they had come out officially asking for suggestion to the solution of the Hindu Muslim problem through suggestions of programmes or schemes from people since October, 1938. This had increased the number of such programmes in many folds, which indirectly made many people think and work in this direction, though it still

concerned mostly with people of letters. Thus, the genealogy of separatism could be put into three stages; the first stage, of establishing the point that there is a Hindu Muslim problem, the second stage, of establishing the point that the Hindu Muslim problem has to be solved through some or the programmes, and the third state, of making people think and work in these directions. Through all these, another thing became clear to all; that the 1935 act for a federal system is not going to work out. What ever efforts had gone into it had turned out to be mere waste of time and energy; though initially the Muslims were enthusiastic about it, later they became the bitter enemies of the act. Neither the Congress, nor the Muslim League now supported it, which directly meant that no one supported it and it is not going to work out at all.

The Muslim League's official request to solutions of the Hindu Muslim problem met with desired results. Many prominent people came out with many programmes. Some people, whom the Muslim leadership considered to be 'experts' were brought to the scene to plan programmes, like the Osmania University Professor Latif. MAH Qadri, another programme maker was an insider of the Muslim League, and Sir Sikandar Hayat was a very prominent statesman. The All India Muslim League had assumed itself to be the voice of the Indian Muslims, whether or not the majority of Muslims were in support of it. Officially, the British also had been considering the views of the League for general Muslim views. But the Muslims League could not say anything much towards some ideas of solving the so called Hindu Muslim problem so far. There was no one who would dare to give out a clear solution from the organisational platform unlike what Rahmat Ali had done some time ago. Instead, the Muslim League had asked 'others' to make plans and programmes to solve the issue, thus not to take any blame should something go wrong. Thus came many proposals ad programmes from all kinds of people, and some of them the members of the Muslim League, and some others not. These programmes were later considered and seen by historians as the then Muslim feelings and sentiments. But then, to my mind, these were not really the real sentiments of the Indian Muslims in reality, the Muslim League was creating a hegemony or an ideology to woe the Muslims into a situation of separatism. These proposals were ideologies, and hegemonies. Nonetheless, it is interesting to take note of some of such proposals. Let us find them one by one.

The first among the programmes appeared in the month of February from a school teacher of Wazirabad, Punjab. On the 23rd of January, the news paper 'The tribune' published an article by one Razaul Karim, which argued that the very idea of separate political existence of Muslims must be abandoned, but instead of that all Muslims of India must be merged into one province. Muhammad Sharif Toosy, the school teacher replied to this article in the 'Eastern Times' of the 10th February. Toosy argued in this article that India is essentially a heterogeneous country and thus it can never become a single unit. "It must be split up into separate, compact, geographical parts where the Muslim minority of 90 millions may be able to hold its own and develop in its own way." He says that there must be two states in India with Muslims in the majority so that the question of Muslims being in the minority shall not exist at all. To this end, he suggests that the Punjab, Baluchistan, Kashmir and the NWFP should for one state in the west and East Bengal and Assam should for another in the east. "Thus the question of Muslim minority will in this way be reduced to its proper limits and Muslims will find two separate States where they will have unhampered chance of developing their own culture and civilisation."(13) On the 24th of March, he

wrote another article in the same news paper, in which he becomes explicit some more, to name the western Muslim region as 'Pakistan'. "If the Muslim provinces are reconstituted into Pakistan and Eastern Bengal and Assam and are granted full autonomous powers with the right of secession, the Muslims may agree to join (14) federation at the centre in a transitionary period." (15)

The next one to have produced a programme was one Dr. Abdus Sattar Kheiri. This was in the month of February. "it can be said without fear of contradiction that the Indian Muslims are the most compact and harmonious group of persons living anywhere on the face of earth They have one language, Urdu, understood not only by all Muslims of India, but also by the large portion of population in Afghanistan, Iraq, Muskat, Aden and Hedjaz." He is so ambitious to say that the Muslims shared a common early history, a common list of heroes, a common code of morality, common principles of social intercourse, a common feeling of solidarity and unity, and the consciousness of common aim and common destiny. His is a typical example of the intellectual's imagination from speculations, of projecting something already conceived to be and later rationalising them. Experiences demonstrates that fact of the matter is just the other way, since, what ever may be the commonness one might venture to see among them, the contradictions are much more luminous. Had he been alive today, the very state and structure of the present day Pakistan could simply have destroyed all his dreams of hallucinations, may even to the point of a possible realisation that he had only been wasting his life. Further, he goes on insisting on the commonness; "if all these common ties and bonds do not make of the Muslims a true nation, what other things do?. He argues that it had been the doings of the Congress that made the Muslims think in terms of separate identity, and had things were as it had been earlier like during the Mughal rule, this would not have been the case. Now, the Muslims must have a right to self-determination in the areas they are more in numbers. Finally, there should be a separate federation for the areas with Muslim majority to make the self-determination possible. (16) During the month of March, Asadullah makes the proposal to divide into South and North and then hand over the entire north of India to the Muslims. Muslims from all over India could migrate to the north of India and vice versa, so that the North shall remain a Muslims majority place to create a Muslim nation out of it. (17)

During the same month, Choudhry Khaliquzzaman made a proposal to partition India in the Hindu Muslim lines from England, while he was there, as claimed in his book 'Pathway to Pakistan'. Though this was not a proposal submitted to the Muslim League, he had later met Jinnah and spoke these things to him on his return from England. Abdur Rahman Siddiqui and Khaliq were in London when the under secretary of State for India Col Muirhead had just returned from his India tour in the month of March. Khaliq obtained an appointment with him to gather his impressions on the latest developments. They met on the 14th of March and Khaliq enquired if Muirhead had met the Muslim leaders. Muirhead said "Yes, I have met your leaders and have heard their case. We have got great sympathy with you but we do not know how to help. You say that British democracy does not suit you and I see that it does not, but we do not know of any other kind of democracy. We apply the principles in India which we apply in our own country, and you do not suggest any alternative." Muirhead was straight coming to the problem, the Muslims were wanting protection in India from the Hindus and they did not say how they must be protected and from what. They had

been speaking about the possibility of a slavery under the Hindus, an idea which was nothing more than a projected fear. They kept saying that they are threatened by the Hindus of a Hindu majority rule. This could be nothing more than a simple mental attitude and nothing else; hence they all failed to suggest any solution to it. Khaliqzaman writes: "as soon as he finished this sentence, I went up to the map of India which was hanging in his room, and pointed out the two areas, north-west and east, which were Muslim areas and which might be separated from the rest of India. When I returned to occupy my chair he said with a smile: 'Yes, that is an alternative. Have you talked about it to Lord Zetland?'" Muirhead himself arranged a meeting for them to meet the secretary and they met him on the 20th of March, 1939. "Lord Zetland was very cordial and after a few preliminary exchange(18) of views about the weather I started by giving him a brief survey of the Muslim relationship with the British Government extending over one hundred and fifty years and brought it down to the Government of India Act, 1935. Thereafter I said, 'Now that you are transferring more powers to India, you are doing it in such a manner that one hundred million Muslims might find themselves the slaves of the majority when you have completed the task.' At this stage he interrupted me and made the same remark which was made by the Under-Secretary, namely, 'But you do not suggest any alternative'. It did not require any searching of my brain for I had already suggested the alternative to Col Muirhead. Therefore, as soon as Lord Zetland raised the question of an alternative, I immediately replied, 'You may partition the Muslim areas from the rest of India and proceed with your scheme of federation of the Indian provinces without including the Muslim areas which should be independent from the rest.'

Lord Zetland : What would happen to the States?

I : They ought to follow their geographical situation. If they are in the Hindu Zone, they must go with them and if they are in the Muslim Zone they must go with that Zone.

Lord Zetland : What about Defence?

I : For what period my Lord? If you want to know for the period that you are associated, in some form or the other, with the administration of India there would be no difficulty in the defence of India, because you can use the armies of both these areas, according to your needs. But if you want to know for the period that you are not in any way connected with the administration of the country, then I beg to your Lordship not to put that question to me, for God only knows what would happen to us then.

Lord Zetland : Do you want an answer from me?

I : It would be presumptuous on my part to ask for an answer to this big question just after mentioning it to you. I have brought it to your notice that this is going to be the stand of the Muslims in the next session of the Muslim League. There is ample time for you to think about it."(19).

On the 28th of March, Zetland wrote to the Viceroy about this meeting. "They talked a little vaguely about the Palestine problem and turned to what they obviously wished to discuss with me, namely, the position of the Muslim community in India in the event of a federation in accordance with the provisions of the Act of 1935 coming into existence. They spoke very strongly on the question and

told me that they did not think that it would be possible for the Muslims to acquiesce in the introduction of the scheme. I asked them whether in these circumstances they have any alternative suggestion of a constructive character to put forward? They replied that they had, and that what they would propose would be the establishment of three or four federations of Provinces and States which would be co-ordinated by a small central body of some kind or another. The whole object of the scheme was, of course, to give the Muslims as great a measure of control at the centre as the Hindus. They were very vague when they came to the details of the scheme, but, I rather gathered that what was in their minds was a federation of the Muslim Provinces and States in North-West India, a further federation of Bengal and Assam and possibly Bihar and Orissa in the east, and a further federation, or possibly more than one, of the other Provinces and States in the remaining parts of India. It was clear that they had failed to consider the practical difficulties in the way of such a scheme; but, I gathered from them that many Muslims were thinking on these lines, and what they told me confirms to some extent the view which I expressed to you not very long ago to the effect that we should probably have greater difficulty in bringing the Muslims into the federation than the Congress.”(20)

Khaliquzzaman returned to Bombay on the 12th of May, 1939, and straight went to meet Jinnah on the very same day. They told him of the entire episode, and told Jinnah that the British would eventually concede partition. “gave him our impression that the British would ultimately concede partition.” Khaliq further says that he also “gave him my view as to why I had opposed to use the word Pakistan for the scheme. He (Jinnah) carefully heard every word of the talk, at times asking me to repeat certain words, and thereafter he said, ‘Have you weighed the consequences?’ I replied, ‘There being no alternative open to us we can not go on talking on the old basis without any result’. He (Jinnah) assured us that he was not opposed to it but it had to be examined in all its bearings.”(21) It is worth noting that how careful Jinnah was in front of the enthusiasm of Khaliq. Perhaps it could be said very well that Jinnah knew well enough that such a Pakistan will go on finding differences with one another from within on all kinds of trivialities, which had become a known matter of fact to the world today. He was not for partition, he was for the well being of the Muslims, and personally, he wanted to defeat both Nehru and Gandhi in politics.

A book, entitled “Confederacy of India” was published in July 1939 by ‘A Punjabi’. This pseudonym belonged to Mian Kafayet Ali, who was born in 1902 in Batala of Gurudaspur District. His father was a Tahsildar in Punjab, and when he died, Mian Kafayet Ali was given a subordinate appointment in the office of the Punjab Legislative Council. He made several efforts to get a nomination for the job of Tahsildar, but never succeeded. He used the pseudonym ‘A Punjabi’ because as a government servant, he was not permitted to publish political writings. He already had many differences with other British employees, and if it was known that he was publishing political material, it would have been very difficult for him. Apart from this book, he had also written many articles in pamphlet form and published them from time to time, both before and after partition. He was following the lines introduced by Rahmat Ali, and also acknowledges that he had been inspired and influenced by Rahmat Ali in writing the ‘Confederacy of India’ as well as many other articles.

The book begins with the fundamental question as to the very objective of Muslim politics in India. There must be two objectives; one to maintain the integrity of Indian Muslims as a separate

community and two, to ensure their economic well being. As for the integrity of the Muslims, he spells out four constituents of Muslim separate existence, such as, one, their faith (Islam), two, their civilisation, three, their culture and four, their languages. The second could be secured by legislation, by creating adequate laws. But in order to safe guard other aspects; the Muslim community has to live a separate life from others. Legislation and pacts can at the most take care of the economic aspects only, but as for the civilisational, cultural, and faith aspects, there is no way to put an end to influences from non-Muslims. All attempts to this had failed, and the only alternative left with the Muslims is to become separate from the Hindus and others. Muslims have to become separate from the Hindu India. By now, four major programmes have come to lime light. The very first was the Latif programme, which involves an exchange of population from all parts of India to the newly found Muslim land. In reality, for the Muslim population from the rest of India was not welcome as well as acceptable to the Muslims of Punjab and the North-West in general. At the very planning stage, migration was disliked and discarded by the Muslims in these areas. Thus Latif proposal did not find many admirers, and Latif himself belonged to the South of India, Deccan Hyderabad. The second programme was the Regional Federation Plan. Many people from the Punjab Unionist party propounded this. According to this, some Muslim minority areas also were included in the Muslim land, and this programme also was not acceptable to the leaders. The third one, Asadullah's proposal suggested exchange of population of the Muslims and Hindus. This also became unpopular, as no one wanted strangers in their neighbourhood, be it Muslims or not. The 'Confederacy of India' proposes a fourth programme.

It is a combination of the tripartite confederation of three federations. An improvement of this was suggested by the Nawab of Mamdot, who published the book of Kafayet. Thus, there will be five federations, namely, the Indus federation, the Hindu India federation, the Rajasthan federation, the Deccan states' federation, and the Bengal federation. This suggestion was much welcome to the Muslims as compared to the other programmes, and they argued that it would also be welcome by the Congress party, which was identified as a Hindu party. The important argument produced was that this programme does not wish to divide India into Hindu and Muslim India, unlike what Rahmat Ali proposed. In effect, this proposal would have made many independent Muslim units within India, though not just separate but extremely separate from the rest of India. And then, if the Hindu Congress party does not yield to this proposal, then the Muslims would ask for a separate state from India. "Muslims should demand complete separation as their right and not as a favour that may depend on the good wishes of any body. In that case they should be prepared to separate their regions without maintaining any link between them and Hindu India."(22)

The very name to the book, "Confederacy of India" is a strange one. But then, this has its own unfortunate reasons. Kafayet was depending on Nawab Mamdot for publishing his book, which he had initially named as "Pakistan" the name most people would have expected. Mamdot sent the manuscript to Jinnah, whose approval they all wanted to publish this book. In the mean time, the book had also already gone to the Press, the Ripon Printing Press of Lahore, where the printing started in anticipation of Jinnah's approval of the books publication. Then Mamdot receives an urgent telegram from Jinnah asking him not to name the book as 'Pakistan', and Jinnah asked him "just to give it another name". Mian Kafayet Ali explains: "I prepared an outline of a confederal constitutional scheme for the sub-continent and incorporated it in the introduction to the book.

Hence the name 'Confederacy of India'. In fact I had been told to present my spade as a spoon. But I took care to give even the spoon a sharp edge.." (23). Jinnah's intervention at this point had changed the name of the book, and there is no idea as to why Jinnah was opposed to the name Pakistan. It is interesting to note that Jinnah simply wanted any other name other than that of Pakistan, which is well evident from his telegram, "Just give it another name" and there is no suggestion at all for an alternative name from him. But then, some thing else also happens which had confused the historians later. Kafayet Ali had originally planed of a three federation, at the time of Jinnah's intervention. Later, the book came out with a five federation plan. Some think that the additional two had been modification from the Nawab of Mamdot, but in some other writings, Kafayet himself is found of speaking of five federations. Some believe that everything is Kafayet's own ideas, but some other believes that everything is Mamdot's ideas. Some others feel that Mamdot had only added two extra federations to Kafayet's three. Actually, it was Mamdot who spent money for publication of the book, and who kept sending the book to many people with his note. No where Mamdot makes claim that he had modified the original manuscript of Kafayet, but instead, he keeps speaking about the author. From his references of the author, it is suggestive that he had himself not written them, but the argument against this also carries many valid points suggesting that the actual author could be Mamdot only. And another thing, why Jinnah had strongly admonished Mamdot to change the name of Pakistan also creates some confusion, as he himself was to use the very name in just few months from this time. Was it because the name Pakistan is that of Rahmat Ali, who was not acceptable to any Muslim organisations because of his independent attitude? Or was he sort of reserving the very name for him to use later, which is highly unlikely, as the name was already floating and popular. Most likely, it was only the Rahmat Ali factor and nothing else.

Many proposals for Muslim separatism had been thriving in the year 1939. The Asadullah proposal for a Muslim north, the A Punjabi and Mamdot proposals, and the like. But then, more proposals were only to come. The Eastern Afghanistan proposal and the Pakistan Caliphate proposals were only to emerge. Sikandar Hayat Khan was to come with his plans, Faqir of Ipi was to come, and two more were to come from the Aligarh autochthones. Though towards the end of 1939, this up coming of all kinds of programmes became rather stale and slow, there still ticked these things until the Lahore resolution from the Muslim League in 1940.

By the middle of July, separatist movements came out from Peshawar. The 'Tarajaman-i-Afghan', a weekly paper published from Peshawar carried a programme of separate land for Pathans, which were supported by some of the major tribes in there. The Mohmands, Afridis and the Wazirs, were all in support of this. The tribes there had even elected their Amirs who were expected to have a meeting in the month of August and chalk out the plans. It was one Abdul Wadud, who published this article in the Peshawar news paper, but the original plan had been lost and nothing further about this is available, and all that is known to us that the name of the programme was "Eastern Afghanistan". However, the 'red-shirt organisation of the Kan Abdul Ghaffar Khan opposed this separatist move very strongly. This could most likely have been a separatist movement from the Pathans, juxtaposing the Muslim League. But it did not make considerable impact, or their would have been divided Pakistan even before the Lahore declaration of the Muslim League.

At the same time, the Punjab Muslim Students Federation made out a programme under the name 'The Pakistan Caliphate'. The point here to be noted is that, this is the first time any one is using the name 'Pakistan' after Rahmat Ali, among all these programme makers. The programme of the Punjab Muslim Students actually is an inspiration from the Tahrik-i-Khilafat-i-Pakistan founded by Ibrahim Ali Chisti in 1937. Ibrahim Ali had also published a programme as well as a map to this effect in the year 1937. It was this scheme that the Punjab Students Federation adopted and they improvised upon it and presented a detailed programme to the Muslim League as Khilafat-i-Pakistan. The students also held a conference in 1940.(24) The students carried the influence of Rahmat Ali in unmistakable terms and they wanted the new nation to be much more Islamic than what Rahmat Ali had wished it to be. They had gone beyond Rahmat Ali to call the new nation a Caliphate, instead of simply calling it Pakistan, to reconfirm the Islamic character. The students also started recruiting youths and started providing them with military training for a fight for the proposed Pakistan Caliphate. Though they submitted their proposal to the Muslim League as the Muslim League was calling for programmes, they always remained strong supporters of Rahmat Ali.

Yet another important programme was presented by the Prime Minister of the Punjab, the leader of the Unionist Party in the Province, and a prominent member of the Muslim League, Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan. The programme was given to the press on the 29th of July, 1939.(25) Sikandar Hayat Khan had been thinking in these lines for some time, and these thoughts had already found expression on various occasions through his speeches as well as writings, in spite of the fact that he was holding a very high office. One such instance shall be his presidential address to the Bombay Presidency Muslim League Conference at Sholapur, in today's Maharashtra. In that speech, he firmly rejected the 1935 act of a Federation and suggested that there should be another alternative to it. "speaking personally, and in the light of the experience of the past two years, I am convinced that the scheme of Federation as embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, has ceased to be suitable, having regard to the rapidly changing circumstances and requirements of the Indian people. I am equally convinced that some sort of Federation suited to the peculiar needs and conditions of India, is essential for the ordered progress of our country. But to be acceptable and workable it must inter alia fulfil the following basic conditions: a) that it secures to India the unfettered right of rising to its full political stature, b) that the autonomy and integrity of the units is (26) effectively guaranteed and that neither the centre nor any unit nor any outside subversive movement shall be allowed to interfere with the internal autonomy and integrity of individual units, c) that the financial provisions of the proposed federation shall have free scope for the development of the units, d) that the important minorities and interest in the country shall be effectively guaranteed to the fullest possible protection and unhampered development of their political and cultural rights, and their due share in the governance and the administration of the country, and e) that the powers of the Centre shall be confined to a few essential subjects and functions and that the residue shall vest either in the individual units or groups of units as they may desire."(27)

Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan is often understood to be for his British loyalty and his respect to the imperial nature of things rather than the cases of the people. Many historians later represent this proposal of Sikandar Hayat Khan as contradictory to what had been popularly known about him.

The importance of these five principles he spelt out in his Sholapur address is such that, when he presented his own programme of separatism to the press later, we can see that this proposal is nothing but an illustration and expansion of the then speech made by him. This shows the consistency and continuity of his mode of thinking. His speech was in the month of May, and in the month of July he presented the full programme to the press. It was named "Outlines of a Scheme of Indian Federation" and it ran into 35 pages. Almost all news papers covered this programme, and subsequently, the author himself had published the full text by getting it printed in the 'Mufid-i-Am' press of Lahore.

His programme starts with a criticism of the Act of the 1935 for a Federation. This had become rather easy, as both the Congress as well as the Muslim League refused to go by the said act, on different ground indeed. For the Muslims, the Act was not giving them what they had aspired for, and for the Congress, the Act meant disintegration of India. Thus both opposed it, with two different and extreme views. Sikandar Hayat khan wanted more autonomy for the Muslims and pleaded in those lines, as all Muslim out fits went on in the same direction. The main points of the Sikandar programme runs as follows. First, there should not be any Federation which makes two distinct components. There should be regional zones, in which one can enter. Secondly, this shall enable the contiguous units to collaborate better. Thirdly, such collaborations shall reduce the possible risk of the two factors, Hindus and Muslims. Fourthly, since the Centre confines its jurisdiction to a few specified subjects of common concern, the provinces as well as the states can enter the new programme of Union on a uniform basis. Fifthly, since the entering of the federation shall be voluntary, the cooperation shall be further ensured. Sixthly and finally, the minorities will not feel any insecurity in this programme.

To make this functional, he spells out a methodology. The first step to this shall begin with the demarcation of seven zones. Zone 1 shall consist of Assam, Bengal and Sikkim. Some districts in the West of Bengal will be excluded to reduce the size of this zone. Zone 2 shall consist of Bihar and Orissa, with the areas from Bengal transferred to Orissa. Zone 3 shall be the united Provinces and their states. Zone 4 shall consist of Madras, Travancore, Madras states and Coorg. Zone 5 shall have Bombay, Hyderabad, Western Indian states, Bombay states, Mysore and the states of the Central Provinces. Zone 6 shall be the Rajputana states, except Bikaner and Jaisalmer. This shall also include Gwalior, Central Indian states, Bihar and Orissa states, Central provinces and Berar. Zone 7 shall be those of the Punjab, Sind, NWFP, Kashmir, the Punjab states, Baluchistan, Bikaner and Jaisalmer. Each Zone shall have its own Legislature, with representatives from both states included as well as the Provinces. Such Zonal Legislatures shall have powers envisaged as in the 1935 act. There shall be no separately elected Federal Legislature. All members of the Zonal Legislature shall collectively constitute the 'Central Federal Assembly', which shall have 375 members, 275 from the Provinces and 125 from the states. One third of the total seats shall be reserved for the Muslims, and for the other minorities, an appropriate share shall be earmarked, under the Act of 1935. Elections shall be conducted as mentioned in the 1935 Act in case of the provinces, but for the native states it is different and rather complicated. For the first ten years, three fourth of the members shall be nominated by the ruler, and one fourth 'selected' by the ruler from a panel prepared by the state assembly or such body. For the next five years after initial ten years, two thirds will be nominated and one third 'elected' as laid down above. After fifteen years,

one half will be nominated and one half will be elected. After twenty years and further, one third will be nominated and two thirds elected. Federal Legislature will be unicameral. Seats can be increased if it is so required, and should be distributed among the Provinces and the states through a formula. But the one third reservations for the Muslims should be maintained through out all cases. The Viceroy, Governor General and the Council of Ministers shall be the Federal executive. The Viceroy will be representing the King of England. The prime Minister and other Ministers will be appointed by the Viceroy, in consultation with the Prime Minister. The Cabinet shall again be governed by four principles. Each zone should have at least one representation in the Cabinet. One third of the Cabinet also shall be reserved for Muslims. Minimum two of the ministers shall be from the representation of the states. For the first fifteen or twenty years, Defence and External affairs Ministers shall be nominated by the Viceroy.

With all these programmes of separatisms, the political situation in the then India continued to be most uncertain and chaotic. The Muslim factor continued to be not compromising on anything that concerns with Islam, and the British continued to break their heads over this issue, such an issue there appeared to have absolutely no solution to it. The Muslim leadership had been creating headache to the administration that there is no hope of any kind of peace with the Hindus. One of the leading articles in the Star of India of the 25th of August, 1939 asserted that “the consensus of Muslim opinion is that in the complete cultural and political, if not Zonal, separation between the Hindus and Muslims lies the only hope of peace in India..... a division into separate entities for political purposes is the natural step, the only step..... Therefore Muslim India rejects Federation and will no longer tolerate Democracy. Hindus and Muslims must part company and dwell apart. Only then can they be friends. Hindu India and Muslim India must divide to unite.”(28). Interestingly, all these claims to separation came in the name of peace and harmony, that is, if at all there ought to be peace and harmony in India, then the Hindus and Muslims must be separated. But, then, all in the name of peace and harmony, and even co-existence!

Such times have arrived, that many people started indicating for separation, if not for complete partition. The separatist intellectuals’ works finally started yielding results, though very restrictedly. Both in India and in Britain, number of Muslim intellectuals were following suit, and making write ups to this effect. One Anwar Bakhshi from Jullundhur wrote at the end of August that “We (the Muslims) are going to unite and have a home for ourselves where we can live an honourable life.”(29) Another person under the pseudonym ‘A Punjabi Muslim’ wrote that “the Muslims through out India represent no doubt a single religious, cultural and social entity. They may even be called a single nation.” (30) (it is another question that if he is so confident that all Muslims are one in every respect, then why this name ‘A Punjabi Muslim’?). The Round Table Conference in the 1939 was confused in these affairs, and commented “they (the Muslims) wish to link all the Muslim areas into a federation and associate them with some sort of Central Government in a way that has never been clearly explained.”(31) The Indian National Congress, which was seen and propagated as a Hindu communal Party by the Muslim leaders continued its struggle to bring it to the Muslim minds that the fear of a Hindu domination and Muslim so called slavery is absolutely unfounded as well as baseless, given Indian culture, tradition as well as history; but these things did not have no much effect with the Muslim leadership. In the mean time, JJ Kedar of the Central Provinces Legislative assembly made a statement that “if the minority community carried a

patriotism beyond India it had no locus standi in formulating the constitution of the country,(32) which had infuriated the Muslim leaders that the Star of India made out an editorial saying "We, speaking for the Muslims of India, emphatically state today that there can be no question of India's political advance within or outside the British Empire without a settlement of the communal question." (33) The Civil and Military Gazette made out another Editorial which said that "Until the Congress has abandoned its extravagant claims to speak for the whole of India and to mould single-handedly the destiny of the country in the future, there will not be found either a solution of the problem of the Muslims and the minorities or an atmosphere favourable for India's advance towards its goal of dominion status." (34). The Times observed that "the schemes which Muslims have propounded for creating a Pakistan of their own has been given a fillip out of all proportions to its value". By now, the Muslim leaders repeated asserting that their community was a nation by itself, which was "directly affiliated with their Moslem brethren from Delhi to Istanbul", and "To ensure a contented Moslem community the Congress Party must come to terms with the Muslim League."(35)

Mahatma Gandhi wrote in his paper 'The Harijan' that 'the Indian Muslims were not a separate nation but a part of composite Indian nation'. He tried to demonstrate the folly and short-sightedness as well as narrow-ness in the Muslim claim of a separate nation-hood just in the name of Islam; he was seriously attacked by the Aligarh autochthones. "We want to assure Mr. Gandhi and our Hindu brethren that the ideal of having free sovereign Muslim states in India, which now inspires a very large number of Muslims, is not actuated by a spirit of hatred or revenge. It is initiated by an earnest desire of solving the Hindu Muslim problem on an equitable basis and epitomises the natural desire of Muslims of India to determine their future independently in the light of their own culture and history.....The political experience of the last fifty years, more especially of the last two years, has strengthened the faith of the Muslim in the above ideal which is now their paramount national resolve. Neither the fear of the British bayonets nor the prospects of a bloody civil war can discourage them in their will to achieve free Muslim states in those parts of India where they are in majority."(36)

When the round Table met in December, they made the following observations on the Hindu Muslim problem. "There is indeed a tendency for Muslims to exercise a right to veto any constitution that may be devised. While Congress still aims at a unified India, which will associate British India with the Indian states, the Muslims are moving more and more towards separation and the creation of a Muslim Ulster in the country as a means of protecting Muslim interests and culture. It is clear that the Congress will have to do something to meet the Muslim case, otherwise the vision of a unified India will evaporate." (37) Sir Stafford Cripps visited India during this time and explored the Indian opinion. He met some Indian leaders including the Muslim leaders like Jinnah and Liaquat Ali Khan. The opinion he formed had been spelt out on his return, in just one sentence: separation of the Hindus and Muslims would be "a necessary part of a new Indian constitution." (38) The estimate of a Cambridge historian, TGP Spear runs like this: "people who had earlier laughed at the first suggestion for some kind of Pakistan were now earnest proponents of the idea." (39) Some other English historians also held similar views of partition as inevitable hazard, like Sir William Barton etc. (40)

The resolution for a separate Pakistan was to come in the month of March 1940, for the first time officially from the Muslim League platform. By now, there had been many proposals and programmes of separation both for a separate nation as well as an autonomous state within India from all kinds of people. Though the inflow of such programmes had slowed down much, there were some final ones, mostly in the form of reshaping and re-patterning their earlier proposals. From the NWFP, came the third proposal from the same Faqir of Ipi again. The information available on this proposal is scanty, barring some reports from the news papers. Mahatma Gandhi had visited the frontier recently and the Muslim League was much sceptical of the visit of Gandhi to the NWFP. They were sceptical that perhaps Gandhi could 'win over the Muslims' to the Congress side. Hence they sent Sayyid Ali Muhammad Rashdi to the NWFP to make a study about the impact of Gandhi's visit there and give a full report to the Muslim League leaders. On his return to Lahore, Rashdi gave a report to the Muslim League leaders and to the CMG (Civil and Military Gazette). The CMG correspondents spoke these words: "the Faqir of Ipi has organised a network of jirgas within the tribal area in order to be able to enforce more effectively on an organised basis his scheme for the constitution of a Muslim State in Northern India." (41) No further details are available on this. Possibly, the Faqir of Ipi was in touch with Abdul Wadud, and they knew of one another's plan. Nonetheless, it may be very ambitious to treat the views of Faqir of Ipi's as in support for any Pakistan plan, as most likely he was planning for a separate Pathan state, independent of both other Muslims as well as India. This idea comes from the fact that, the Faqir had tried to do the same after the formation of Pakistan hoping for supports from other Pathans from Afghanistan. But these are speculations and not based on evidences.

The Mohammadan Anglo Oriental College at Aligarh had turned into a Muslim University at the instance of Sir Sayyid, and the Aligarh Muslim University had ever since been a good catalyst in producing separatists. The University had intense Muslim activities, which had many times turned easily into separatist lines. On the 15th of August, 1939, a major programme of separation was prepared by two Professors at the AMU, Sayyid Zafrul Hasan and Muhammad Afzaal Husain Qadri. They had it published by the Aligarh Muslim University Press, and this had later come to be known as the Aligarh Scheme. They laid out five principles on which their programme is based and insisted that every Indian Muslims "must insist persistently and strenuously" (42) on these principles. The first principle is that the Indian Muslims are a Nation by themselves. "They have a distinct national entity wholly different from the Hindus and other non-Muslim groups". The second principle stated that the Muslims "have got a separate national future and their own contribution to make to the betterment of the world." The third principle is that the future of the Muslims "lies in complete freedom from the domination of the Hindus, the British" and for that matter from "any other people". The fourth principle taught that the Muslim majority area will not be permitted "to be enslaved into a single all India federation with an overwhelming Hindu majority at the centre". The fifth and last principle is that the Muslims living in the Hindu majority areas as minorities "shall not be allowed to be deprived of their separate religious, cultural and political identity, and that they shall be given full and effective support by the Muslim majority Provinces". (43)

One of the authors, Afzaal Husain Qadri was a member of Rahmat Ali's Pakistan National movement when he was in London. When he returned to India from England in 1938, he tried to popularise the Rahmat Ali ides among the Indian Muslims, and was rather a lieutenant to Rahmat

Ali. Thus, the Aligarh programme carried an indubitable and unmistakable mark of influence of Rahmat Ali through out. The only option remained is the division of India as Muslim and non-Muslim India. India should be divided into three, from this programme. The North West India covering NWFP, Punjab, Sind and Baluchistan becomes one Muslim nation, a Pakistan, the second Muslim nation shall consist of portions of Bengal, Purnea district of Bihar and Sylhet district from Assam and some such places, could be called Muslim Bengal. The rest shall be 'Hindustan' and even in this Hindustan which is supposed to carry all non-Muslims, the still Muslim pockets such as Meerut and Rohilkhand, Delhi, Aligarh and Agra area, Malabar area etc all should be autonomous area, though under Hindustan. Further, "all towns of India with a population of 50,000 or more shall have the status of a borough or free city." All native princely states will have to join the main state, and when one such state happen to fall in between one of the state, it can opt to join either in Muslim rule, or in non-Muslim rule. But they make one exception here in case of the Deccan Hyderabad to be sovereign, not associated to any of the three free India, with additional area of Karnataka also annexed to it! Obviously, though not spelt out in the original programme, Kashmir is already a portion of the New West Indian Muslim state, and with the inclusion of Kashmir into the NWFP, Punjab, Sindh and Multan combination, it becomes a Pakistan as it was thought by none other than Rahmat Ali. And with this Aligarh programme of separate Muslim nations, the inflow of new programmes to solve the impossible Hindu-Muslim problems seemed to have come to an end. No further ideas came up, in some significant manner. It appears that the history had already set the time for March 1940, for the Muslim League leadership to officially declare the Pakistan call half heartedly and with much hesitation through Jinnah. Perhaps had it been another leader other than Jinnah, he would have hesitated more, but by now, Jinnah had already reached a point of no return from his Nehru hatred and Gandhi dislike. He did not have to be prudence motivated at all, as he was not dependent on the name and fame from the Muslim League leadership; he could easily quit the Muslim League also as he had done to the Congress once before and just go back to England, where he was always much more comfortable and at real ease.

The year 1940 began with no much change in the political scene of India. There were the same Muslim talks about the possibility of democracy should the British leave; the same talk about a majority Hindu dominating the minority Muslims and so on, some speculations here and there of a totally separate Muslim land as a solution to it, and some speculation of some kind of federation where this Muslim apprehension could be ruled out. On the 9th of January 1940, the Civil and Military Gazette wrote that "After all the basic influence at work in Indian politics today is the deep rooted suspicion of the Muslims (as of other minorities) As to what the congress, with its overwhelming Hindu membership and its socialist tendencies, would do with any constitution which they were enabled to impose upon India yet every statement made by Congress leaders is tending to enhance that suspicion instead of removing it."(44) On the 22nd of January, The Madras Mail repeated similar idea: "The minorities would not be fearful did they not apprehend that the majority would use the power given to them by the introduction of further constitutional reforms for the purpose of suppressing or thwarting minorities."(45) The Times reported that the demand from Congress for a declaration from the British about the future of India gave a "distinct fillip to the Pakistan scheme, long cherished by those Muslims who aim at segregating their community into self-contained areas of their own."(46) After few days, the CMG

said: "it is impossible to resist the conclusion that the stress laid by the Congress and political organisations championing the cause of the Hindus on the rights of the majority has, to a large extent, persuaded Mr. Jinnah and a considerable section of the Muslim population in India that the Hindus are employing democracy only as a means to gain political mastery over all other communities. The insistence of the Congress on the acceptance by the British Government of its formula of the constituent assembly as the solvent of all India's political problems has further confirmed the suspicion of the Muslims and other minorities of deep laid Hindu plot to establish Hindu rule in India."(47)

Perhaps the Indian National Congress never anticipated the Lahore session declaration of a separate Pakistan from the Muslim League, especially when Muhammad Ali Jinnah was the President. In spite of his Nehru hatred and Gandhi dislike, he was not in for separate Muslim nation at any point. Just three days before the Lahore session of the Muslim League, and five days before the call for Pakistan, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad was addressing the Indian national Congress annual session at Ramgarh. Had the Congress any suspicion of an impending Pakistan call, Azad who himself was a Muslim, that too from today's Saudi Arabia, would have definitely resisted it in strong terms. But instead, his speech, which was a long one, makes only the following mention regarding the Hindu Muslim problem and that too very optimistically warding off all confusions regarding a separate Muslim nation. This is what he spoke from the official platform of the Indian national Congress as its then president: "The thousand years of our joint life has moulded us into a common nationality. This can not be done artificially. Nature does her fashioning through her hidden process in course of centuries. The cast has now been moulded and destiny has set her seal upon it. Whether we like it or not, we have now become an Indian nation, united and indivisible. No fantasy or artificial scheming to separate and divide can break this unity." (48) Obviously, there were no apprehensions at all about the impending call for a separate Pakistan to emerge from the official platform of the Muslim League from the president of it, Jinnah. Azad was in fact a very confident man as to the 'indivisibility' of India into Hindu and Muslim lines. To all his reasons as well as knowing the Indian Muslims, such a phenomenon was nothing but impossible. And yet, the tables turned, miraculously. For Abul Kalam Azad, the indivisibility of India was just a matter of common sense, and precisely this was the intense fear of all the separatist Muslim leaders as well. Personally Jinnah had nothing at all to loose, and upon impressions and convincing by others, he finally did go for it. When some one asked Maulana Abul Kalam about the increasing Muslim fear of a Hindu domination, he replied in these words: "Can such a vast mass of humanity have any legitimate reason for apprehension that, in a free and democratic India, it might be unable to protect its rights and interests?"(49) The Congress remained confident that separation is impossibility, in spite of all Muslim League activities.

The beginning of 1940 was as usual, with no particular indication of the March call from Lahore resolution. There were the usual kinds of write ups in the news papers, the usual fear of the possibility of Hindu domination should India become democracy and the like. On the 5th of January 1940, Muhamad Sharif Toosy wrote in The Eastern Times about the problem. He was thinking in terms of the majority Muslim areas primarily. Indeed there are majority Muslim areas in India, both to the west and east, which are some times exclusively Muslim. If India becomes a democracy with the natural formula of majority rule, what will happen to those Muslim majority areas in west

as well as east? They are already comfortable with no others interfering in their affairs, something akin to a Muslim rule. They are already autonomous in many ways. When it becomes the Hindu majority rule at the centre, there is this strong possibility of Hindu infiltration and domination in these areas also, as the State apparatus shall be going to be Hindu majority, apart from such government policies as coercing the Muslims. The Muslims who are already a minority in Hindu majority areas are naturally helpless; they have to continue to be minority as it had always been the case with them. Thus Toosy argued that the Muslim majority areas of both east and west must become independent of the Hindu majority rule, though the already minority Muslims in Hindu majority areas in all other places may have to continue their plight.

On the 10th January of 1940, another article appeared in the Star of India named 'Hindu-Muslim Relations and the Future of India' by one Khan Bahadur Abu Abdullah Muhammad Zakaullah Khan. According to the editorial it was a paper by him, but nothing is mentioned as to where it was either published or read originally. He argued that the 1935 Act had to be rejected by both Hindus and the Muslims, as it was not in the interest of both the communities. But this rejection was done by neither community. The ideas expressed for Zonal arrangements "have been characterised as fantastic and impracticable." He intends no partition, but parity. "I can say, without fear of contradiction, that if any scheme for the future constitution of India can be devised which will ensure equal partnership of Hindus and Muslims in the future governance of India that will be wholly acceptable to the Muslims and it is for the Hindus to say whether such a scheme would be acceptable to them." How ever he was very clear about the impossibility of Hindus and Muslims living together any more other than either under a Muslim rule, or under something like the present British rule. In any case, it is impossible for the Muslims to live under a Hindu majority rule. "We do not want to help in the framing of a constitution which will enable the majority community to dominate over us for all time. We do not want to help in forging the chains that would keep us down for ever." He argued that there shall be no need to divide India. The Muslims must be given autonomy as proposed in the 1935 scheme, so that "There should be no need for division of India into Hindu or Muslim zones or for any exchange of population which in a country as thickly populated as India with the present level of the education of the masses is not a practical proposition." He expressed hope that the Hindu-Muslim problems "will adjust themselves in course of time", provided, that "the majority community in a province is not backed and supported in its misbehaviour towards the minority community by its majority in the centre and this can only be secured if Hindus and Muslims are given equal representation in the Centre." He suggests that after keeping few seats for the other minorities at the Centre, the rest are to be equally divided among the Hindus and Muslims. How ever, as usual, this too had to be another fantastic dream, which the non-Muslims shall never be agreeing to.

The Muslim intellectuals seemed to have been hankering much in the few hundreds of years of Muslim rule in India through invasions, to make their claims for either 'Muslim rule' or 'equal rights' with the Hindus. What they do not want to think about is, the question, what is India after all? Is India Muslim rule alone? India should have been seen with the entire cultural past and glory, that arises both from pre-Vedic, Vedic, as well as post-Vedic period. When the Muslim intellectuals deliberately wishes to close their eyes towards this aspect, the whole enterprise ends up in the self stultification and self alienation of such Muslims from India as such. Thus, it is natural that no one

except the separatist Muslim intellectuals shall take these claims and plans seriously, and this one also includes vast majority of Muslims who do not carry separatist notions.

Certain aspects of all these plans and schemes are very interesting. Except the Sikandar scheme, all other proposals carry the unmistakable mark of Rahmat Ali. They may be said to be suffering from the inescapable influence of Rahmat Ali. Why so? First of all, Rahmat Ali was the only one who made a clear cut proposal towards a separate Muslim state. Secondly, all the planners implicitly wanted separate Muslim states, but knew it very well that the majority Muslims of India will never want separate Muslim state, and so they had to disguise and polish their interests for their prudence, to find support from majority common Muslims who are not intellectuals. The ideas of Muslim nationalism though far older than Rahmat Ali in the minds of the intellectuals, had no locus standi among the common Muslims. Since Rahmat Ali had nothing to fear of a public opinion, he went ahead with his ideas, in his own manner and ways, which influenced all separatists, but none of them dared to acknowledge him in any way! It could be argued that some of the planners were not aware of Rahmat Ali, at least for the sake of argument. But then, some others were evidently connected with Rahmat Ali, who also did not mention his name, for the reason I had mentioned earlier, of becoming unpopular among the common Muslims who are not separatists, then, now, and shall also be so in future. Punjabi, though not a member of the 'Pakistan national movement' spent several years spreading it and popularising it in the Punjab. He was so deeply impressed by Rahmat Ali, and even borrowed the term Pak-Stan from him. He wanted to use the name Pakistan for his programme, but it was Jinnah who formidably refused the use of the term. It is obvious that Jinnah did not want to have anything to do with Rahmat Ali, either implicitly or explicitly, and even after the formation of Pakistan Jinnah and other maintained this aversion to him, to the point of throwing out Rahmat Ali from Pakistan when he returned to live in his dream land from England! Something, definitely, is rotten in Denmark!!!! I sincerely hope that some day, some one shall do some work to find out as to why Rahmat Ali was so mercilessly rejected by the leaders of Pakistan in all times.

Another interesting point to think about. Separatist ideas came much more from Punjab area, and much less from Bengal area. This also has explicit reasons. Bengal was more culturally Indian as compared to Muslim Punjab, the Bengali Muslims were lesser alienated from Indian culture than the Punjabi Muslims. Even for the Bengali Muslim intellectuals, separating from India were not a 'necessity'. Yet another interesting point to be noted here is that all such ideas of separatism came only from the intellectuals, who actually had nothing much to do with the common people and their 'common' sentiments. As it is often experienced in the so called academics, intellectuals so called do stay away from common realities, which are of no worth to them, and regularly refuse to come down from their self-erected intellectual pedestal, which often happens to be much shallow and at times utterly foolish. Intellectuals keep talking about society, social commitment and the like on the one hand, and on the other hand, some of them are socially impossible as well. What they keep speaking is always for the others, and hardly for themselves. Some people might call it lightly as hypocrisy; but I would like to address it as the lack of unity in thought and action, and the absence of a moral or cultural bridge between what one thinks and speaks of aloud, and what one actually do in ones life, especially in the absence of others.

Reference

1. 'The Statesman' editorial, 16 January, 1939.
2. A Muslim correspondent, (anonymous) 'What Muslim India Thinks: Are the Muslims a Minority in India?' CMG, 3rd February, 1939.
3. Gulshan Rai, 'The Muslim Minority in India', CMG, 22nd February, 1939
4. Bayback (psuedonym), in an article in 'Medina', 28th March, 1939, pp. 252 – 3, Quoted in Waheed Qureshi, *op.cit.*, pp. 143 – 4.
5. IAR, 1939, Vol. I, p. 66, 'India in Home Policy' by Suresh Chandra Dev.
6. Candidus, 'Indian Political Notes: Muslim Out Look on Country's Future', TTI, 5th April, 1939.
7. M. Nasim, Vice President, Muslim Students Federation, Motihari, Bihar, TSI, 17th April, 1939
8. HV Hodson, 'The Struggle for Power in India', Fortnightly Review, May, 1939, pp. 556 – 557.
9. Marquess of Zetland, 'Essays: The Memories of Lawrence, Second Marquess of Zetland', London, 1956, p. 250.
10. *Ibid*, p. 251.
11. CMG, 23rd May, 1939
12. Shahed, 'Dar-el-Islam', The Statesman, 16th June, 1939.
13. Muhammad Sharif Toosy, 'Misreading of History of Turkey: Real Lessons for Indian Muslims: Salvation in Separation from Hindu India', The Eastern Times, 10th February, 1939.
14. M Abdullah Khan, President, Municipal Committee, Wazirabad is the name given in the news paper. 'Are the Muslims a Minority in India' TET, 24th March, 1939. In reality, the author was Muhammad Sharif Toosy, Headmaster, MB High School, Wazirabad. A Rahmat Ali account
15. M Abdullah Khan, President, Municipal Committee, Wazirabad is the name given in the news paper. 'Are the Muslims a Minority in India' TET, 24th March, 1939. In reality, the author was Muhammad Sharif Toosy, Headmaster, MB High School, Wazirabad. A Rahmat Ali account.
16. Abdus Sattar Kheiri, '90 Million Muslims Form Biggest Nation in India' TSI, 25th February, 1939.
17. Advocate Asadullah, *letter*, TSI, 22nd March, 1939.
18. *sic*.
19. Choudhry Khaliquzzaman, 'Pathway to Pakistan', Lahore, 1961, pp. 204 – 206.
20. Zetland to Linlithgow, 28th March, 1939, Zetland, *op.cit.*, pp. 248 – 249.
21. Khaliquzzaman, *op.cit.*, p. 211.
22. A Punjabi, "confederacy of India", Introduction, pp. 56 – 60.
23. KK Aziz, p. 533.
24. Abdus Sattar Khan Niazi, *Khilafat-i-Pakistan*, Lahore, February, 1970, pp. 25 – 26.
25. Published in news papers on the 30th of July, 1939, IAR, 1939, Vol. I, p. 67.
26. *sic*.
27. Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan, *Presidential Address*, Bombay Muslim League Conference, Sholapur, CMG, 7th May, 1939, also in IAR, 1939, Vol I, pp. 378 – 381.
28. TSI Editorial, 25th August, 1939
29. Anwar Bakhshi from Jullundhur, *letter*, CMG, 30 August, 1939.
30. A Punjabi Muslim, 'Sidelights on Muslim Politics - II', CMG, 10th September, 1939.
31. Round Table, no. 116, September, 1939, p. 773
32. CMG, Debates, 9th November, 1939

33. *TSI, Editorial*, 6th November, 1939
34. *CMG, Editorial*, 14th November, 1939.
35. India Correspondent, "*India and the War: Congress Demand: The True Way to Satisfaction*" *The Times*, 5th December, 1939.
36. *Joined Statement issued from Aligarh by Dr. Muhammad Afzal Hussain Qadri, Dr. Zakiuddin, Dr. Burhan Ahmad, and Ubaidullah Durrani*, *TSI*, 12th December, 1939.
37. *Round Table*, No. 117, December, 1939, p. 161 E.
38. Colin Cooke, '*The Life of Richard Stafford Cripps*' London, 1957, p. 288.
39. TGP Spear, '*Public Opinion in India, 1924 – 45, : Some Personal Impressions*', Paper read at the Study Conference on the Partition of India, 1947, at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, July, 1967.
40. '*India's North-West Frontier*, London, 1939, p. 13.
41. Reported in *CMG*, 9th August 1939. They also made out an Editorial on the same day about this. The *TSI* (The Star of India) also carried a report on Rashdi's impressions on the visit of Gandhi on the 17th of August, 1939.
42. Syed Zafrul Hasan and Muhamad Afzaal Husain Qadri, '*The problem Indian Muslims and its Solution*, Aligarh, 1939',
43. [Ibid]
44. *CMG Editorial*, 9th January, 1940.
45. *TMM, Editorial*, 22nd January, 1940.
46. India correspondent, '*India's many voices*', *The Times*, 10th February, 1940.
47. *CMG, Editorial*, 14th February, 1940.
48. Abul Kalam Azad, *Presidential Address, Indian national Congress*, Ramgarh, 19th march, 1940, *IAR*, 1940, Vol I, p. 300.
49. Quoted in *TMM, Editorial*, 19th March, 1940.

Chapter -8-

The Enigmatic Jinnah and Lahore Declaration

So far, the Muslim League had not commented at all about any of these programmes, and they themselves did not even attempt for any such programme. Some of the programme makers like Sikandar Hayat Khan and MS Toosy were members of the Muslim League, but their programmes were their own private opinion, and they had nothing to do with the Muslim League.

Many people wish to portray Jinnah as the key person behind Pakistan of late. There are also many controversies with regard to this especially in India and Pakistan. They had been quoting from Jinnah to form these ideas, quoting him as he went on speaking against the Hindu attitude at times, which are only occasions. Jinnah spoke formidably for the Muslim cause at times, when he was speaking to such gatherings. Other wise, his consistent attitude was never one of separation, he simply wanted the Muslims to be protected in a 'Hindu India', and went on working towards such a goal with the Congress, as a matter of fact. Some such anti Hindu speeches of Jinnah are context bound, and are worth noting. On the 5th of February 1938, Jinnah was speaking before Aligarh Muslim University Union, where he vented out some of his feelings as a repercussion from the Round Table. "But I received the shock of my life at the meetings of the Round Table Conference. In the face of danger of the Hindu sentiment, the Hindu mind, the Hindu attitude leads me to the conclusion that there was no hope of unity". (1) Actually he was airing out his then feelings to the AMU folks, but the records of speeches at the RTC or his letters of those days does not mention any of such feelings. That was a temporary feeling, most likely, at the instance of the AMU people.

In post independent Pakistan, some historians made out an industry of constructing Jinnah as the Pakistan autochthon on such scanty evidences. One of them made out a case of Jinnah's Cambridge visit of the 1931 - 32 to make his point that Jinnah was for the Pakistan idea even before Rahmat Ali. The Cambridge Muslim association invited him to speak and he spoke to them on the 6th of June in the Old Combination Room of Trinity College. The speeches of Jinnah was reported to be that of "nationalist but one who understood the Muslim case and still thought the best way was understanding with the Hindus". The second occasion was a tea party at St. John's College. (No date is available). Here his speech was reported to be one that of "a note of pain and dismay as he expressed doubts on Congress views about accommodating the Muslims". They also quote his 1932 visit as the guest of honour of the Indian Majlis annual dinner to make out the case that he was for Pakistan. It is reported that "he was positive about the fairness of the Muslim demand for guarantee and said that if the Congress could not give them their legitimate due they might have to go alone(2)" from these, it was concluded that "it was in these eventful days that the idea of Pakistan took root in the Quaid's mind".(3)

It is true that Jinnah was very unhappy with the RTC's way of dealing with the Muslim issue apart from the attitude of the Congress. Jinnah was disillusioned with the Congress, he was disillusioned with the Muslim League, and he was also disillusioned with the Muslim Conference. Unhappy with all these lot equally, he wished to withdraw from everything and wanted to go back to England to settle down, and live a normal life as a leading barrister. Jinnah was never a believer in solving the Hindu Muslim problem through dividing India, and such ideas never occurred to him. He was far beyond narrow separatism and petty sentiments of the smaller minds.

Sir Muhamad Shafi, in 1931, told to the January RTC that if some one interprets Sir Muhamad Iqbal's 1930 presidential address as a Pakistan demand, then it is not at all acceptable to the Muslim League, and he spoke on behalf of the entire Muslim delegation. Jinnah was not at all in favour of any such idea, and he did not even have such an idea in spite of the insult from Nehru that "Jinnah is finished". None of his letters available to us of this period show any indication that Jinnah wanted a separate Muslim Nation. Jinnah had returned to India following Nehru's insult in 1934, and from 1934 to early 1940 it is explicit that he was only very anxious to reach some kind of settlement with the Congress, to form a coalition government and to work the provincial form of the 1935 constitution. The 'Pakistan idea' was never in the minds of the Muslim League either. They did not even subscribe to the so called 'two Nation theory', which rather is the obvious first step to partition of India, until 1936. Even in 1936, when the Muslim League was supposed to have subscribed to the two nation theory in principle at least, it was simply a technical acceptance, as it was only in the form of the Presidential address at the Bombay session of the Muslim League which Sir Wazir Hasan was addressing on the 12th of April, 1936. He said that "the Hindus and Muslims inhabiting this vast continent are not two communities but should be considered two nations in many respects". His statement was actually a qualified one, as he went on speaking "So that when the British parliament is withholding the inauguration of full responsible government in this country, it is resisting two great nations of the world and not only two communities". (4) It is clear now that the expression 'two nations' was to make the Indian challenge more formidable to the British, and not to make a stake for separation of the so called one nation from the other. Hence, to even say that the question of two nations was spelt out by Muslim League in 1936 shall be a spurious affair.

Evidently Jinnah did not like at all the term 'Pakistan', which belonged to Rahmat Ali. Leave alone partition or separation, Jinnah hated not only the very idea, but also the very Rahmat Alian term of Pakistan. The Punjab Muslim Students Federation was unhappy with the Muslim League elders on many fronts. Imprudent as they may appear to the Muslim elders, the students were mostly influenced by Rahmat Ali and his ideas. As it is the normal case with the students, they shall be more for ideals, and shall have nothing to loose. They are not yet matured into the 'benefit praxises' in politics. In September 1937, the Punjab Muslim Students sat down for a meeting to set a goal for them as distinct from the one that of the Muslim League. After much deliberation, they set their goal as 'the establishment of a Muslim National state in the North West of India with the Punjab, Sindh, NWFP and Baluchistan'. Clearly, this was Rahmat Ali's original plan and programme, but the students very carefully avoided mentioning the name of Rahmat Ali and also had avoided the name Pakistan. This obviously was to escape from Jinnah's displeasure. They all were well aware of Jinnah's aversion to the very name Pakistan as well as partition those days.

There used to be other references for some kind of a Muslim autonomy, as the Muslim Leaders did not wish to share anything with the Hindus. It was a simple feeling of not sharing anything with non-Muslims, not only with the Hindus. The Muslim intellectuals wished for everything separate and exclusive only for the Muslims and they projected the thoughts that the Muslim identity lies in possessing everything exclusive for the Muslims, as distinct from non-Muslims. They did not want to share, and at the same time, did not want to be shared, such used to be feeling of insecurity with the Muslim intellectuals, which eventually created separatist theories and ideologies. The Calcutta Muslim League Conference passed a resolution on the 26th of September, 1937 to this effect. The resolution recommended that “the attainment of complete independence and the creation of a free Islam within a free India should be adopted as its creed and ideal at the coming session of the League”(5). However, the Muslim league did not take any note of this. There were many people, wishing for more Muslim autonomy, and separation in implicit terms, some even under the influence of Rahmat Ali. But there remained Jinnah, always against any such ideas, and always wanting to be working with the Congress shoulder to shoulder, but in equal terms. Jinnah was for Hindus and Muslims living together in equal terms and shoulder to shoulder, but he was not very conscious of the venom of separation already inflicting many Muslim minds about separation from the Hindus, and separatism itself. At the same time, Jinnah kept warning the Congress, the Hindus, the British and every one in very strong words against planning to deprive the Muslims of their just rights.(6)

The news paper, ‘The Star of India’ was not officially a Muslim League organ, but unofficially it was. It was backed by funds provided by the individual members of the Muslim League for this precise purpose, and more over, though an evening daily, it was the only English news paper for the Muslims then. The league thinking was reflected through the Star of India. On the 1st, 4th and 6th of October 1937, the TSI published three long leaders as editorials under the title ‘Not an Ulster’. It began like this: “It is not an Ulster that Muslims seek to establish in India, but a free and independent State in which no community shall tyrannise over another community”.(7) In the second editorial, it is said that there is an irremovable difference between the Hindus and the Muslims. “To the Hindu, his religion is intimately and wholly concerned with India alone. To this he adds his love of the land he lives in..... Therefore, the Hindu concept of nationalism is different from the Muslim concept of Nationalism and the Muslim cannot, like the Hindu, regard India as the be-all and end-all of his political as well as of his spiritual existence. Herein lays the difference – which constantly leads to the different attitudes in the Hindu and the Muslim”. (8)

This perhaps is one the best intellectual legitimisation of the Muslim separatism as against the Hindus and India in particular. The Muslim intellectuals aspire for a global Islamic culture and spirituality, which is nothing short of Pan-Islamism, and they wish to work towards such a thing, which is expected to eventually culminate in some kind of a Dar-UI-Islam. Is it universalism? Had it been some kind of universalism, then separatism would have been impossible, but it is narrowness within pan-Islamism which disguises itself into universalism, that longs for separate identity for the Muslims through out the world. They speak of trans national boundaries for the sake of religion, and do not consider the point that Muslims in each society is different from one another except for the point of religion. This Muslim attitude could be shown as self stultifying when compared to Christianity. Would the Christians in any nation say the same thing? Would

they say that they stand for a universal Christianity at the cost of other religions in their own societies? No Christian, even the Catholics who are much more systematic and organised the world over in the same manner had ever dreamt of speaking such things. Had the Muslim intellectuals sensible enough in taking lessons from the Catholic Church in particular and Christianity in general, there would not have been any separatist and hate theories from the Muslims, and there would not have been any terrorism in the world today. The third editorial elaborates these points further, and suggest for a change in the attitudes of the Hindus. However, it is still interesting, that there still is no demand for a separate Muslim state out side India, the demand still is for cultural separation and not for political separation. Even with such epistemological justification for Islamic separatism, the TSI had not dared to explicitly demand for a separate Pakistan, and as a matter of fact, they must have been waiting for a green signal from the Muslim League party. Further, there was Jinnah, who was all against the very idea of Pakistan.

But then, Jinnah was soon to change his policies, he had to, under pressure and changing scenes from many quarters. He must certainly have not been a happy person to change his ideas of a Hindu and Muslim India, and eventually to make the Pakistan call, to use the very term that he had hated all his life. In 1938, the Bombay Provincial government refused to include a Muslim League man into the ministry. Jinnah spoke to the Governor, but the Governor expressed his inability to intervene under the provisions of the Constitution. All behind the curtain efforts of Jinnah to put the man into the ministry failed, and perhaps this incident worked as the immediate cause for his change in policy. Jinnah literally became violent and shouted: "That means that we the Muslim League who represent the Muslims are to have no further say in the government of this province or of any other province in India where the Congress are in a majority. That is the end. There is nothing more to do except to get a State of our own for the Muslims if this country".⁽⁹⁾ Jinnah told these words to Sir Francis Low, thumping the table in front of him and in fury. But still, other than such private talks, he still did not speak any such things in the open, or in public for the next two years. Had there been any indication, even a slightest one from Jinnah favouring the Pakistan idea, or some such implication, there is no doubt that the Muslim intellectuals and other separatists would have made a huge celebration of it. Most of the people of today's Pakistan desperately want to some how prove that Jinnah had been pondering the idea of Pakistan in his mind; and spoke it out when time came. However, the reality of the case seems much different, Jinnah never even wished to think in terms of separate Muslim existence apart from India, he was always against and outspokenly against it on all occasions, and eventually when he had to spell it out from the Muslim League platform for the AIML, he had done it under extreme pressure, and after realising that he had no other way, or go. It was the most helpless and hapless action under coercion for him.

Perhaps had it been not for Jinnah, the Muslim League would have demanded Pakistan much earlier than 1940, since the Rahmat Ali factor was all time alive and active, which also had many supporters particularly from the younger lot. The number of separatists was in the increase, and the supporters of Pakistan idea was also in the increase in spite of the Jinnah factor. Perhaps many of the Muslim leaguers found Jinnah the most formidable obstacle to a Pakistan idea, but those who did not subscribe to the Rahmat Ali plan always found Jinnah upright and correct. For the supporters of the Rahmat Ali idea, they waited for an opportunity to vent their ideas out, and found one in the Karachi conference of October 8 to 13, in 1938.

Sindh province did not have a Muslim League branch. In May 1938, some people took initiative to establish a unit of the Muslim League in Sindh. To this effect, the Muslim League convened a provincial conference at Karachi and invited top League leaders to it, including Jinnah. Sir Abdullah Haroon took the initiative; he himself became the chairman of the reception committee, collected good amount of money for it, and invited all top Muslim Leaders from all over India. Around ten thousand delegates attended the meeting as per the report of 'The Daily Gazette' of Karachi (10). In the presidential address, Haroon spoke at length, surveying the political situation in India. It must be noted that Jinnah did not speak much in this conference. Haroon blamed the Congress and the Hindus for their 'indifferences' to the Muslims and creating such a situation that makes it impossible for the Muslims to live with the Hindus. If they continue to ignore the Muslim interests, Haroon declared a warning, that the Muslims will be compelled to ask for a separate space for their very existence. He said that "India can never present a united front as long as the majority community is determined to annihilate the individuality of minorities. I warn the majority community that if it does not concede our demands Czechoslovakian happenings would find an echo in India as well. If the Germans in Czechoslovakia, who numbered hardly 35 lakhs, could assert themselves, there is no reason why nine crores of Indian Muslims and the other minorities would not be able to protect themselves against the evil intentions of the majority..... We have nearly arrived at the parting of the ways and until and unless this problem is solved to the satisfaction of all concerned it will be impossible for anybody to save India from being divided into Hindu India and Muslim India, both placed under separate federations".(11).

Here too, Jinnah's presence had made the difference, the Sindhi leader could not explicitly ask for a Pakistan in the Rahmat Ali manner. Separating from India, he had to make conditional, if the Muslim interests are not satisfied. He could not simply ask for a Pakistan, for the fear of Jinnah. In the speech of Jinnah, which followed Haroon's speech, Jinnah did not mention the Haroon demand and did not either endorse up on or support it. He went attacking the Congress party instead for creating mistrust in the Muslim minds. He accused the Congress for their "arrogance, opportunism and oppression" levelled against the Muslims. He accused that the Congress is unwilling to come to terms with the Muslims and are engaging in false propaganda against the Muslim League. (It is imaginable, what Jinnah implied by false propaganda against the Muslim League, and perhaps this was implicitly checking separatist ideas spoken out by Haroon). Jinnah said that the Muslim League is a 'National' body, a progressive organisation, and is devoted to protecting Muslim interests. Indirectly, Jinnah was saying that the Muslim League has nothing to do with the ideas of separate Muslim land as demanded by Haroon. He made the Congress responsible for making people like Haroon think in separatist lines. He clearly indicated the responsibility of the Congress when he stated that the Congress is creating "a serious situation which will break India vertically and horizontally". At the reference of the Germans in Czechoslovakia as made by Haroon, he used it to warn the congress further through saying "just as the Sudeten Germans were not defenceless and survived the oppression and persecution for two decades, so also the Mussalmans are not defenceless and can not give up their national entity and aspirations in this great continent". Jinnah warns the Congress to "mark, learn and inwardly digest" the lessons from the Germans of Czechoslovakia (12). With such speech delivered right after the implicit call for separate Pakistan from Haroon, Jinnah had actually refuted the separatist call from Haroon and indicated that the Congress ought to correct themselves so that the Muslims

and Hindus can co-exist in India under one nation. Sikandar Hayat made a speech in which he refused the Congress claim of nationalism, in support of Haroon, though his speech was rather moderate, for fear of Jinnah (13). Fazlul Haq, the fiery Bengali leader made a provocative speech in spite of Jinnah's presence, in a come what may manner. He concluded his speech by saying "If Mohamed Bin Kassem, an eight year old (14) lad, with eighteen (15) soldiers could conquer Sindh, then surely nine crores of Muslims can conquer the whole of India". (16). The separatist tendencies and the Pakistan idea had become deep rooted in the minds of many intellectuals, that some of them at least crossed the boundaries to displease Jinnah to express their sentiments in whatever possible strong words given Jinnah's presence.

The point here is simply this that Muhammad Ali Jinnah was ever against separatism and the Pakistan idea, in spite of such strong calls for separate Muslim land. He constantly and continuously worked towards a Hindu Muslim co-existence where Muslims shall be equals with the Hindus, and indeed hoped that it could be a possibility some where in the future. It seems that Mohammad Ali Jinnah was single handedly fighting with separatism within the Muslim League, and against the Pakistan idea, and the influence of Rahmat Ali. It was his clear demand that Muslims must be equal with the Hindus, and if it is not done, then it was entirely the responsibility of the Congress. He would not say that it shall be the responsibility of the Hindus, which had been seeing things in the right political perspective, the power game, the chair game, the Nehru and Gandhi factor, an un seen caucus within the Congress and the like. Jinnah constantly and consistently stood against separatist tendencies and ideas and narrow communalism.

Though Jinnah deliberately snubbed the separatist notions, it made no impact on the Sindhis. They went ahead passing a resolution entitled 'Communal settlement' which numbered five. This was their main political resolution, which was moved by Shaikh Abdul Majid Sindhi through a half an hour presentation. The resolution was seconded by Nawab Mushtaq Ahmad Gurmani of Punjab, and supported by Haroon of Sindh and Sayyid Abdur Rauf Shah of the Central provinces. The resolution stated that "if the Congress did not concede Muslim rights, Muslims would have no alternative but to fall (17) on the Pakistan scheme" (18). This was the resolution passed by the Sindh Provincial Muslim League, and they urged the All India Muslim League to proclaim a similar statement. But the Muslim League objected to this, just because Jinnah was the president and he was against partition. Now for the sake of AIML, strictly speaking for the sake of Jinnah, they had to make some changes in the text, and the changed text read as follows: "This Conference considers it absolutely essential, in the interest of an abiding peace of the vast Indian continent and in the interests of unhampered cultural development, the economic and social betterment and political self-determination of the two nations, known as Hindus and Muslims, to recommend to the All India Muslim League to review and revise the entire conception of what should be the suitable constitution for India which will secure honourable and legitimate status to them" (19).

The news papers made enough and more confusions here, by publishing both resolutions (20). The star of India called it a most important document and stopped it there. The Madras Mail suggested that India could be divided in communal lines in their editorial of the 13th October. Since news papers published both the versions of the resolutions, it is impossible to judge as to which resolution people are making comments on. However, only the changed and amended resolution was presented to the All India Muslim League by the Sindhis, though they had succeeded in letting

the cat out. The Sindhi Conference was compelled to reject the Pakistan scheme officially, but they could make the idea popular. Muslims League was happy to please Jinnah, and happy to have evaded a conflict between the separatist and non-separatist ideas.

Officially, the Muslim League had not committed to the Pakistan idea, nor did they ever support it in public. Nonetheless, many Muslim leaders within the Muslim League also kept spilling the Pakistan idea in implicit terms from time to time through out the year 1939. There were enough and more hints both implicitly and explicitly. At times there were such remarks from some of them, even mocking the Central authority of the All India Muslim League in their dillying and dallying with the Pakistan idea. The Sindhi leader Haroon met the representatives of Majlis-Eh-Pakistan of Lyallpur and Majlis-Eh-Pakistan of Lahore at the Nedou's hotel on the 29th of January in 1939. He told them that the Pakistan idea must be propagated, and it must reach the people. He expressed his confidence that all educated Muslims are for the Pakistan idea, and given proper propaganda and organisation, the Pakistan movement will take firm roots in the minds of all Muslims (21). Next, the very general secretary of the Muslims League, Liaquat Ali Khan, told the Meerut division of Muslims League on the 25th of March 1939 that "Whatever scheme is finally adopted, it is obvious that if the Hindus and Muslims can not live amicably in any other way, they may be allowed to do so by dividing the country in a suitable manner..... If this is done, a limited and specific federation would not only be easy but desirable" (22). In Sindh Hyderabad, Haroon made another statement on the 1st of May. He stated that British free India "would lead to Hindu domination to which Muslims would never submit" (23). In the same month, the Raja pf Pirpur spoke to Allahabad Muslim League Conference "Let me tell you that the Muslim League is the expression of the determination of the Muslim nation to have full and unfettered freedom in free India" (24).

People were spilling out the Pakistan idea, but yet very carefully. Look at the answer of Ali Muhammad Rashdi when he was asked a direct question about the Pakistan idea opinion of the Muslim League: "I can say only this much, that the Muslim League refuses to agree to the Muslims being placed under any Hindu majority. In view of such a decision, the Muslim League is considering the various schemes which have been placed before the sub-committee appointed at Meerut for that purpose. The main feature of these schemes is that they all aim at the creation of separate home lands for Muslims and Hindus in order to avoid repetition of present conflicts. This automatically solves the question of Pakistan also, because the North block of Muslim provinces will constitute one of the Muslim zones which these schemes propose to create. The final programme of League in this respect has yet to be settled, though what I have just explained has been agreed to"(25). The Bindiki branch of Muslim League was held on 20th and 21st of May, in the Deccan. In the Presidential address, Mawlana Muhammad Faruq explicitly outlined a brief Pakistan scheme. People cheered and greeted him with enthusiasm, and on the second day, they passed a resolution approving and commending the Pakistan scheme (26). In the very next month, June, Sir William Barton projected a brief outline of a partition of Hindu and Muslim India, and according to him, was given to the league for their approval. The Muslim League could now not afford to stay away from the impending partition, as Jinnah could no longer contain it. Leaders from all over India were thinking and speaking about partition in their own capacity. Jinnah was slowly getting singled out.

Jinnah was becoming isolated and singled out. The stature of Jinnah was something akin to a Mogul Monarch; no one would even stand in front of him straight. He commanded such tremendous respect among the Muslims and they revered him in unconditional terms. But the Muslim intellectuals slowly worked out the Pakistan programme systematically isolating the Jinnah effect for the time being. Though no one must have had the courage to speak these things to him in direct manner, the Muslim intellectuals succeeded in creating somewhat popular sentiments among the educated Muslims, who were in low lime lights. Suddenly, Jinnah found every one around him speaking for the Pakistan idea, leaving him alone among the intellectuals, who assumed claim for the majority Muslims. Nonetheless, Jinnah continued hopeful, and he knew very well about the Pakistan effect if such a thing had to come, he knew that it is going to be another Pandora's Box.

There were many programmes and schemes in front of the Muslim League to solve the Hindu Muslim problem, most of them suggesting living apart. A special session of the AIML Council was summoned in Delhi towards the end of August to look at and consider these programmes. (27). Jinnah was getting more and more compelled and pressure was building upon him. He was being more and more helpless. Some Cambridge Students went to meet Jinnah as a delegation advocating for Pakistan. He said "I am getting more and more convinced that you are right in spite of myself" (28) This one statement makes his helplessness explicit, albeit he had not agreed to the Pakistan idea in any manner till now.

Even by September and November of 1939, Jinnah remained against the Pakistan programme in spite of every one lauding it. Many of his statements are witness to this. On 28th of September, he spoke to the Osmania old boys expressing his faith in the Hindu Muslim pact. During the same period, he also told the Muslim Youth "Muslim League, as you know, stands for complete freedom of India, not for one community only but for all the people comprising this great subcontinent; and stands for free and independent Islam". (29)

The year 1940 saw the AIML officially demanding for a Pakistan through Jinnah. But even few months before this, from January to march period, Jinnah was trying hard for a pact with the Congress. On the one hand he wanted the Hindus and the Muslims to live together in spite of all the hate philosophies weaved out and propagated by the separatist Muslims intellectuals for a hundred years of period, and on the other hand, he wanted to silence the separatist Muslim intellectuals on the Pakistan issue. Just before the Lahore session of the Muslim League, he submitted a five conditions proposal to the Viceroy to work together with the Congress to rule India. Perhaps this was the last desperate effort from Jinnah to remain in the United India and to silence the separatist intellectuals. Assuring a united India, he demanded that (1) The Congress should abandon the Vandemataram as their national anthem, (this eventually happened, in spite of Pakistan, the Congress abandoned Vandemataram for national anthem, and replaced a song by Tagore in a hurry, a song that was written to welcome the visiting British monarch originally. This still remains as the national anthem (which is unfortunate). (2) The Congress flag should not be flown from public buildings, (3) The Congress should stop trying to 'wreck' the League, (4) Coalition ministries should be formed in the Congress provinces and (5) no measure should be passed by the provincial assembly if two third of the Muslim members opposed to it (30). Jinnah was still prepared for a Federal India. He rather knew that now the ball remained in the court of the

Congress and Nehru; Jinnah was so totally helpless as most of the Muslim leaders were now influenced by the nearly one hundred years of Muslim separatist intellectuals propaganda. No one could do any thing more than this for the unity of India at that time from the Muslim League forum, and let us say, that history knows it best, that Jinnah had done his very best to stop partition of India. Had Nehru been sensible, less egocentric, the partition of India could have been avoided with the full support from Jinnah.

Suddenly it started appearing that the only person who wanted to avoid the division of India was Jinnah among the then Indian political leaders. Gandhi indeed wanted to avoid the division, but the method he adopted was Muslim appeasement, which will have to go on ad-infinitem, as their demands were never going to end. The method of Gandhi could certainly have not avoided the division; it could have prolonged it, but the Muslim intellectuals and their separatist and hate philosophy could not have been contained simply through appeasement. Nehru on the other hand was too personal with things, and did not think very seriously about the division. It is likely that his concern was about his own leadership, and of becoming the Indian leader once the British leaves. He was less of a people minded leader than a glamorous one, and a popularist under the auspicious of none other than the Gandhi himself. It appears that other than juxtaposing Nehru, Jinnah was not much concerned of political power and leadership. He already was respected by people like a King itself, and the new power did not make much difference to him. By the 1940, Jinnah had just one and only problem, and that was of containing the separatist Muslim tendencies inflicted in many educated minds by the intellectuals through a hundred years of time. To contain this danger, perhaps he knew very well, that he only could have acted. Common Muslims could only have listened to one man and that was Jinnah, and to make them listen to him, he had to be some one very important in the new and free India, some one like the Prime Minister. If the most important position was given to Jinnah, then the separatist Muslims could have not spoken anything at all, and Jinnah could have easily managed the affairs so long as he remained alive.(albeit the fact remains that Muslims would have continued to be a pain and problem for any peaceful co-existence with the Hindus) And this, Nehru would have never allowed, he had already been groomed to be the first Prime Minister of India, and was really craving to be that.

With Jinnah becoming the new Prime Minister of free India the division could have been avoided, but only for the time being. A Pakistan would not have come into existence, but the new India would have to have faced all the separatist thoughts that were created and propagated for a hundred years by the Muslim intellectuals. With the death of Jinnah, India would have gone into all kinds of internal problems and even to some thing akin to civil wars, and all time and energy would have to be spent to contain the disgrunts from instigated Muslims instead of the development programmes. For the Muslims, it would have been far better to have remained in India than in their Pakistan of today, they could have breathed free air and lived their religion in their own way other than through their now capsulated religion as given to the commons through interpretations of fanatics. But for the non-Muslims, co-existing with a community who were inspired at the thoughts that they are always different and separate from all others for a hundred years, would have continued to be a nightmare. With their basic premise erring and different, the Muslims fail to live together with non-Muslims for long, and thus, the division of India into India and Pakistan had eventually worked out in the interest of the Indian society only.

The Pakistan makers did not bother at all about the other Muslims living among Hindus in various parts of India, and the millions of Muslims living among non-Muslims all over India. They were primarily concerned only about certain pockets, which were often of their own. This is typical of any separatist or hate philosophy, they shall not want to live with whom they consider as 'the other', and they shall not want to do anything with them. Though the separatist Muslim intellectuals were supposedly speaking for all Muslims, and they projected themselves as if they are speaking for all Muslims of the world itself, in actuality, they were only speaking for their own, narrow, and immediate circles of Muslims. All programme presented to the Muslim League had been such; they all were speaking for Muslims of Punjab, NWFP, Sindh and some times Baluchistan. Even Bengal was left out by many of them as far flung. Rahmat Ali's Pakistan is one that of this typical phenomena. In the lines of Hitler, he wishes to establish the Punjabi Muslims as the most superior, and that too those of in and around Hoshiarpur. Hitler spoke of an imaginary Aryan as a race, and he further innovated this theory by speaking about the most racially pure Aryans as the Nordic Aryans. Any kind of separatism and hate philosophy is bound to suffer from such internal contradictions, which will disintegrate them in time to many fractions one conflicting and contradicting with all others. I need not make any demonstration for this principle; the Pakistan today itself is the best example to this. After separation from India, within such a small span of time, Pakistan had found differences among themselves. Initially they thought that Islam would unite them onto one organic whole, but then they were so initiated into separatism, they found that there are 'many Islams', and each Islam is distinct. Then they found differences among many sects within Islam. Further, they took the mother tongue as a criterion for difference. People with different mother tongue are seen as different ones, though all Muslims. Then came geographical differences to make the differences, separatism and hate philosophy complete. This in fight had retarded the growth and progress of Pakistan making the people go back in time though years as happened in Afghanistan. Jinnah knew very well that it is an impossibility for Pakistan to exist as an organic structure, and he foresaw their internal differences making a mess of the new found nation, and that is why he was deeply disturbed when eventually Pakistan became a reality.

The Muslims League leaders had already collected various proposals from many so called intellectuals and leaders to solve the Hindu Muslim problem. Under the present crisis, the foreign committee of the Muslim League met on 2nd of February to discuss these programmes submitted to the Muslim League. The whole issue was so sensitive, and then the Jinnah factor, the foreign committee did not want to take any decision of belling the cat; instead it passed another resolution asking the working committee to take a decision. The working committee met another day, and after much hesitation, passed a vague resolution of partitioning India. This, however can not be accounted for the Muslim league's demand for Pakistan, it was only a demand by the working committee for their leaders to decide upon.

During the months of January and February, Jinnah met the Viceroy along with Sikandar Hayat Khan and Fazlul Haq. The Viceroy was rather confused and unhappy at the attitude of the League, and actually asked them to be specific and concrete in their out look and demands. He wanted them to say clearly whether they want a separate Muslim land or not in clear terms. Prior to this, Sikandar had already met the Viceroy and the viceroy had informed him that Jinnah was "static to a dangerous degree", as the league fails to convey to him what really the League wants.

Linlithgow wanted clear demands from league so that he could clearly tell Britain what the demands are. As the British were getting the feel that they are not going to last in India much, they wanted to divide India before they leave, may be because they knew that if they leave India just like that, the Hindus and Muslims will never cease to fight one another. Sikandar discussed this further with Fazlul Haq subsequently. Their problem now was none other than Jinnah.

Jinnah met the Viceroy on the 6th of February, 1940. By then the League was tentatively all set for partition, only the official declaration was pending. But Jinnah said nothing of such things to Linlithgow, and about the decision of the League made just three days ago. Linlithgow clearly told Jinnah that he was for dividing India into Hindu and Muslim states, as told to Sikandar and Fazlul. Jinnah on the other hand asked the Viceroy to speak to the Congress that unless they change for the sake of the Muslims, there is no other way other than to divide India. Linlithgow pressed Jinnah to disclose what the Muslim League policy was, but here too Jinnah did not give a definite answer. He replied that at that moment he was not in a position to say "the considered opinion of his colleagues and himself on this very important subject and that he would be very shortly ready to do so". Linlithgow could not get the answer he was looking for, and he wrote to the secretary of state for India that "If he (Jinnah) and his friends wanted to secure that the Muslim case should not go by default in the United Kingdom it was really essential that they should formulate their plan in the near future. At the risk of wearying him I was bound to repeat what I had often said before that I was convinced that it was quite useless to appeal for support in Great Britain for a party whose policy was one of sheer negation". Jinnah's position was that he and his people would "make public at any rate the outlines of their position in time to enable him to explain the Muslim position in Great Britain and in India".(31) Jinnah knew very well that his party is predominantly in favour of Pakistan, but yet he said nothing about such things to Linlithgow. What is more, Linlithgow also knew the entire development, but was waiting to hear it from Jinnah, officially to enthusiastically divide India before they eventually quit. Not only this, Jinnah never made any statement in his public activities about the decision or 'feeling' of his party, and he left no record on the Pakistan wish of the Muslim League at any point.

On the 25th of February, he was addressing the Muslim League Council, and this was one occasion where he was expected to speak something openly. But all he said was the following words: "People ask me what is our goal..... The whole question is very simple. Great Britain wants to rule India. Mr. Gandhi and the Congress want to rule India and the Mussalmans. We say that we will not let either the British or Mr. Gandhi rule the Mussalmans. We want to be free." (32) There was no mention of a separate state for the Muslims or Pakistan. His thoughts and ideas of this period is otherwise made clear through his speeches and writings, which has no place for a Pakistan in it. In an article written in the British magazine 'Time and Tide' he says that "a constitution must be evolved that recognises that there are in India two nations who must both share the governance of their common motherland".(33) On the 6th of March, when he was speaking to the Aligarh University Union, he said that "One thing now is obvious, that we are by no means a minority but a solid and distinct nation by ourselves with a destiny of our own..... There can be no settlement (with the Congress) except on equal terms and on a footing of perfect equality" (34).

On the 13th of March he met the Viceroy again and asked him to improve the Hindu Muslim situation in India. His demand was to have some kind of constitutional arrangement which shall make Muslims equal with the Hindus in every respect. He then said that without such an arrangement, his friends would make him go for separation from India, indirectly hinting at the Pakistan proposal. Still, it was not presented as his ideas to Linlithgow, which Linlithgow was looking for such a long time. Towards the end of his discussion with the viceroy, he sounded frustrated to go to the extent of speaking "in favour of a Muslim area run by Muslims in collaboration with Great Britain. He was fully aware that this would mean poverty, that the lion's share of wealth would go to others, but the Muslims would retain their self-respect and their culture and would be able to lead their lives in their own way" (35). If nothing worked out, then his friends may want him to call for some form of separation, but he definitely did not want the mention of the Pakistan at all. By this time, the League had already adopted the Pakistan demand in their Working Committee, which was then just pending public call officially.

In the meantime, during the months of January to March, hundreds of articles appeared in the media demanding partition and Pakistan. People were some what ready for the holy land, Pakistan, as if realisation of an old dream (36). Jinnah was obviously under tremendous pressure. Why Jinnah desperately wanted to avoid the Pakistan is a question that needs to be discussed, but later.

The Muslim League had a kind of sub committee under the name of 'Foreign Committee' which was to effectively study and suggest solutions to the problems of Indian Muslims. There is no authentic record as to when this committee was appointed, who appointed it etc. there are two different versions about the origin and scope of this committee, and there is no suggestion justifying the very strange name for a committee as foreign committee. Some source say that the Sindh province Muslim League appointed this committee in October 1938 "for the purpose of examining the question of demanding effective safe guards for the Muslims". It is also said that it is this committee that subsequently recommended the creation of a separate Muslim state, which was endorsed by the working committee of the Muslim League (37). This explanation does not explain the name 'foreign' committee, which still remains strange. Another version says that the foreign committee was formed at Delhi on the 4th of December, 1938 with Haroon as the president with the object "to disseminating literature and information regarding the position of All India Muslim League". By the August of 1939, the Foreign Committee had established an office in London and centres at Basra, Baghdad, Beirut, Damascus, Constantinople and Cairo. This description fits with the name the 'Foreign Committee'. Nonetheless, the activities of the foreign committee as we know do not seem to fit into the name as a Foreign Committee.

The Muslim League Working Committee then appointed another Constitutional Subcommittee at their Meerut meeting on the 25th of March, 1939 to examine the various schemes and programmes given to the Muslim League by many people. (The schemes or programmes were given to the Muslim League or the so called Foreign Committee is an ambiguous question still). The Constitutional sub committee had seven members, and they were Jinnah, Sikandar Hayat Khan, Sayyid Abdul Aziz, Khwaja Nazimuddin, Abdullah Haroon, Sardar Awrungle Khan and Liaquat Ali Khan.(38). According to Ashiq Batalawi, the committee had nine members and not seven, and the committee was asked to study only five schemes, those programmes presented by Latif,

Punjabi, Rahmat Ali, Sikandar and the Aligarh dons. Batalawi makes a mistake here in saying that all these five programmes had one thing in common, that none of them wanted a separate Muslim state, and they all stood for an autonomous confederation within Indian Union. This is an obvious mistake, as we know very well that Rahmat Ali did want a Pak-Stan in explicit terms and he did not want to have any connection even with Bang-Eh-Islam, Hyderabad Deccan, or any other Muslim pocket in rest of India. He had already designed the geography and people in his 'Pak-Stan' in clear cut terms.

The appointment of the committee was put before the Muslim League council and Jinnah spoke these words in April at New Delhi: "In regard to Federation, there were several schemes in the field including that of dividing the country into Muslim and Hindu India. These schemes were before the committee which had been set up by the Working Committee of the League. The Committee was not pledged to any particular scheme. It would examine the whole question and produce a scheme which, according to the Committee would be in the best interests of the Muslims of India (39). There was much confusion as usual about solving the Hindu Muslims problem. Ali Muhammad Rashdi spoke to some news reporters on this on the 11th of May, and he suggested of creation of some Muslims zones, and the other Muslims scattered all over India to be shifting to one or the other of these Muslim zones. How these zones will be created, and what will happen to those hapless Muslims living in non-Muslim majority area were questions which had no definite answers from any one. Things were mostly made up of emotions and at times, even hate philosophy.

The Foreign committee that met in Delhi on the 2nd February of 1940 called the creators of the programme to a meeting and discussion. Abdullah Haroon presided the meeting, and discussed nine programmes with its creators. A resolution was passed and given to the Muslim League Working Committee asking "to state its mind in unequivocal language with regard to the future of Indian Muslim nation and prepare the latter also for launching a struggle to achieve the following fundamental rights about which the Muslim nation of India is absolutely definite and clear in its mind". They identified five 'rights' as follows.

1. The Muslims of India who constitute ninety millions of people are a separate nation entitled to the same right of self-determination which has been conceded in respect of other nations,
2. The Muslims of India shall in no case agree to be reduced to the position of a minority community on the basis of extraneous and foreign considerations or for the sake of any political convenience or expediency,
3. That in order to make the Muslim right of self-determination really effective, the Muslims shall have a separate national home in the shape of an autonomous state,
4. That the Muslims living in the rest of India shall be treated as the nationals of the aforesaid Muslim State and their rights and privileges shall be fully safeguarded,
5. That any scheme of Indian reforms interfering with these basic principles shall be stoutly resisted by Indian Muslim nation till it has achieved the aforesaid objective"(40).

They also appointed a nine member sub-committee to draft out a detailed constitutional scheme to achieve these rights. The very next day, which is on the 3rd of February 1940, the Working Committee met and decided to send a delegation consisting of Fazlul Haq, Sikandar Hayat Khan, Khwaja Nazimuddin and Khaliqzaman to London to meet the British Prime Minister and place

these demands to him. They were also to meet the secretary to the State of India to place the same demand in front of him as well. Yet, there was no certainty as to what exactly they are to demand from the British, there were many confusions and uncertainties even with the high powered delegation as to what exactly they are going to demand. And then, they reached a decision; and Khaliqzaman narrates how it was reached in his own words:

"I asked the President (Jinnah) give the members of the proposed delegation to London some definite guide lines in regards to the matters which it was to place before the British Government for its acceptance. I informed the members of my suggestion to lord Zetland, for separation of Muslim areas from the rest of India, and told them that the views expressed by me on that occasion were my personal views. But now, I said, the Muslim League should give its delegates its considered view as to the future status of Muslims in India Personally, I said, I would suggest confining our demand to separation of Muslim zones, viz., NWFP, Sindh, Baluchistan and Punjab in the north-west and Bengal and Assam in the east and would leave the rest to the Congress to deal with. At this stage sir Sikandar who was sitting to the right of Mr. Jinnah started pleading for his confederal scheme and Mr. Jinnah opposing it (41). The discussion went on for about two hours when finally, with the concurrence of the members, Mr. Jinnah rejected Sir Sikandar's scheme and entered in his note book my suggestion with approval. I do not know how many people realise when it was that for the first time the Muslim League working Committee decided to claim the division of India" (42). Haroon, in his capacity as the Chairman of the foreign committee published the February 2nd resolution passed by the foreign Committee. He had done this in 'The Times' of the 19th February, under the title, 'The Muslim Demand'.(43) There was no mention about any decision of the Working Committee, which imply that at the time of Haroon's writing to the 'Times' the working committee had not reached any concrete decision. Haroon wrote the letter to 'The Times' on the 13th of February and the Working Committee had met on the 3rd of February. So, on the 3rd working Committee, there was no decision on Pakistan.

The 27th Annual session of the All India Muslim League was held at Lahore. The proceedings began at 3 PM on the 22nd of March, 1940. The Nawab of Mamdot was the Chairman of the Reception committee, and his was the first speech at 3 PM on the 22nd of March. Then Jinnah gave his long extempore speech, and with that that day's session ended. The next day, on the 23rd, the session began at 3 PM with Fazlul Haq, who introduced "The Lahore Resolution" and spoke on it. Khaliqzaman seconded the resolution and spoke for it. Further, Zafar Ali Khan, Sardar Awrungleb and Haroon spoke of the Lahore Resolution, explaining and supporting it. That day's proceedings ended with that. The next day, on the 24th of March, the session began at 11.15 in the morning. The main theme, the thrilling theme of discussion was indeed the Lahore resolution demanding Pakistan for the Muslims. Elaborating the resolution, speeches were delivered by Nawab Ismail Khan of the United Provinces, Qazi Isa of Baluchistan, and Abdul Hamid of Madras. It was then that Jinnah arrived, who was supposedly in another function elsewhere, and sat on his presidential chair. Speeches on the resolution continued and those who spoke were Ismail Chundrigar of Bombay, Sayyid Abdur Rauf Shah of Central Provinces, and Dr. Muhamad Alam of the Punjab. Enthusiasm was bouncing in all the speeches and both the speakers and the members attending were getting carried away in the thoughts of a Dar-ul-Islam finally getting realised for the sake, exclusively for the Muslims. Abdur Rehman Siddiquie was waiting to

introduce what he came prepared for, the Palestine resolution. Here Jinnah interfered with the enthusiastic speakers who were not stopping, and allowed Siddiquie to present his resolution on Palestine. Sayyid Raza Ali and Abdul Hamid Badayuni supported the resolution and were passed. Speakers were not stopping at the Pakistan proposal, so then the session was adjourned to meet again at nine in the night after food. The night meeting began with two left over speeches on Lahore resolution by Sayyid Zakir Ali and Begum Muhammad Ali. Then as a matter of official proceedings, the Lahore resolution was presented to the house for a voting, which was subsequently declared officially as been passed unanimously. They had two more resolutions to be presented to the house and adopted, one on the Khaksars and another on amendments to the Party Constitution, which were quickly presented without wasting much time and passed by the house. Then they had to elect office bearers for the coming year, which was done so quickly, and Jinnah made a very short speech to end the session at 11.30 in the night.

But, interestingly, there is some confusion here. Pakistan officially celebrates their Pakistan day on the 23rd of March, with the presumption that the Lahore resolution was passed on the 23rd of March. Actually, the Lahore resolution was introduced on the 23rd of March, but passed on the 24th of March. There began a quarrel between historians and officials alike when eventually Pakistan became a reality, and some historians are touchy about the date of Pakistan day celebrations and they still go on quarrelling. However, the government officially takes 23rd of March as the Lahore resolution day, as the resolution was introduced on that date. I do not know why both parties who quarrel even today see this point that one day it was introduced and the next day adopted! Thus with the very Lahore Resolution, the Muslim intellectuals of the 1940 and later got something anew to draw differences on and quarrel. However, when it came to the independence of Pakistan they did not dispute much on that day, the fourteenth of August midnight. India adopted fifteenth of August as their day of independence, since the declaration came at midnight of the 14th of August. But here, the Pakistani intellectuals did not quarrel much on the 14th of August as their independence day, for a reason very interesting. They were all too happy that they got their freedom a day before India got it, and so there were no room for them to find differences on that date!

The chief part of the Lahore resolution reads as follows: "Resolved that it is the considered view of this session of the All India Muslim League that no constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to the Muslims unless it is designed on the following basic principles, viz., that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted, with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary, that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority, as in the North-Western and Eastern zones of India, should be grouped to constitute 'Independent States' in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign"(44).

The term 'Pakistan' is not used in the resolution. The resolution also does not explicitly demand a single Muslim state, but Muslim states wherever the Muslims are in majority. Perhaps it was too early for the Muslim League to make clear cut picture of the proposal, and they were all divided in their opinions in details, though the separatist Muslim intellectuals all stood together for a Muslim nation separate from India. But they remained different from one another in the details of the proposed Muslim nation, which was a usual after effect of any separatist ideology. But then, there

evolved many ideas in the years to come, till the real division in August, 1947. There were seven more years to go to this. The Muslim League Working Committee of the September 1940 and February 1941 and the annual session in April 1941 spoke of two states instead of four. Jinnah also was speaking about two States in his expressions from 1940 to 1943.(45). But he was still not using the name Pakistan in his expressions. In a special interview given to the 'Daily Herald' of London, Jinnah said the following words: "Our aim is that those areas where Muslims outnumber Hindus shall become a separate Dominion or even dominions"(46) There was no clarity as to how these dominions shall be connected, or whether they will be connected at all and questions like that. The term Pakistan was still not used by him.

It still took four years for Jinnah to speak of Pakistan. But on the 18th of September 1944, in a message to the 'Muslim Nation' he referred to "the home land comprising of Pakistan"(47). On the 14th October of the same year in an interview to the London based 'Daily Worker', he said the following words: "it is in these zones that the Muslims wish to establish Pakistan as an independent State". From then on, Jinnah had consistently mentioned of one Muslim separate State of Pakistan only. When the elected legislatures of the Muslim League met in a convention in Delhi in the month of April 1946, they passed a resolution of making amendment to the Lahore Resolution, to read 'States' as one 'State'. Some people including Jinnah said that the expression 'States' was a mistake and the resolution meant only one state. Some disputed, and some aired out their opinions, but Jinnah stood for a single State of Pakistan. Jinnah finally settled the issue, "what really mattered was the intention and not the word. In fact, he (Jinnah) directed that the records be rectified. Thus, this minor controversy on the words 'State' and 'States' was put to rest by him" (48).

The Jinnah factor had created many controversies, especially in India on later days. Independent Pakistan had settled both with Muhammad Iqbal and Muhammad Ali Jinnah as the Pakistan autochthons already. For them, it had become the 'Official Doctrine' that the Pakistan idea was conceived by Iqbal and put into reality by Jinnah. Historians who tried to differ from this had to face the consequences, of past, present and perhaps also of future. About Iqbal and the myth created around him, we had already discussed in a previous chapter. Jinnah comes into picture of late, and in fact now only. A discussion on Jinnah becomes important, especially when many myths are going around the personality of Jinnah.

Certain things are touchy with perhaps every one. Certain things do not want to be discussed in certain societies. Pakistani society does not want to discuss some thing different about Jinnah other than their Official Doctrine. India is also no exception. They also do not want to discuss many things, one example is that of the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi and the assassin, Nathuram Vinayak Godse. It is taught right from School level that Mahatma Gandhi was assassinated by Nathuram Godse, but hardly any one gives a convincing reason why did he do that. As a child, I was much confused with the question as to why at all a personality like Mahatma Gandhi had to face such a violent death, and no school teacher ever answered my innocent doubts and questions. They always said, they are complicated matters and you will know when you become big and learn much. Even today, no one wishes to discuss this, except, perhaps by some communists, who try to use this to put the blame on the right wing Hindu movements and the Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh. But then, that shall be purely political lie, and far from reality.

Now to Muhammad Ali Jinnah. Both Jinnah and Nehru had so many things in common. Both Jinnah and Nehru were fully westernised and far from being religious. Neither Nehru was a religious Hindu, nor was Jinnah a religious Muslim. Both had adopted western life style, and both did not have serious sense of belonging to many things Indian. Both studied Law, and wished to live in London given a chance. Both were neither fundamentalists nor fanatics, and both were liberated from religious as well as strong national ideas. In a word, both were international characters. But then, as time went by, we see both Nehru and Jinnah opposed to one another, and pleading for Hindus and Muslims respectively, at least in principle.

We know that the Pakistan idea was originated in the mind of Rahmat Ali, who even made out a map of Pakistan with striking similarity with the actual Pakistan. Rahmat Ali called in Pak-Stan in Urdu, which was later translated into Persian as Pakistan. Jinnah never even wished to hear the very name Pakistan, and he consistently opposed both the idea as well as the terminology. We saw earlier that an angry Jinnah asking to change the Pakistan name to anything else when Punjabi wanted to print his book through a telegram sent. We also saw Jinnah consistently and continuously opposing the idea of separation from India in all means available to him tooth and nail. Jinnah went out of the Congress and into the Muslim League, but he always wanted to have trade with the Congress in 'equal' terms. Slowly, people were leaving his side one by one, and grouping for a separate Muslim nation, Pakistan. His friends wanted a separate Muslim state, a Dar-ul-Islam under the name of Pakistan, some of the British high officials who wanted to divide India were compelling Jinnah to make the Pakistan demand, the Foreign Committee of the Muslim league had passed a resolution for a separate Muslim home land, the British officers who knew all these developments were pressing Jinnah to make the demand. Yet, Jinnah was against a separate Muslim home land in the sense of a Pakistan. Under extreme pressure, Jinnah had to yield to the Lahore Resolution in which the name Pakistan was never used only for the Jinnah factor. The Lahore Resolution did not carry terminologies like 'two nations' and 'Pakistan'. The resolution was carefully drafted, and seriously made, all because of the Jinnah factor. When Jinnah came to the stage, much enthusiasm of the enthusiastic speakers for the resolution and separation just vanished like anything. And Jinnah himself never used the term Pakistan anywhere, in spite of extreme pressure from all quarters even after adopting the Lahore resolution in 1940. Another four years he continued not willing to use the term Pakistan desperately. Only in 1944, a long four years after the adoption of Lahore resolution, Jinnah ever uttered the word Pakistan for the first time, and thereupon he stood for Pakistan in the real sense of the term.

Why? Why Jinnah was against the division of India and Pakistan? It is here that much confusion occurs and people get into confusions to confuse all others. The division of India and creation of Pakistan in the name of the Islam religion had embarrassed Indian Muslims. The embarrassment caused then is still an embarrassing factor to the Indian Muslims, even after so many years. Nearly a hundred years of separatist ideologies and hate philosophies by the separatist Muslim intellectuals, the overwhelming volume of literature created by them, the amount of speeches and talks spread by them through out the country, the crafty and cunning logic designed by them and the religious sentiments created by them, all such things, did not become sufficient to get the majority of Indian Muslims to their side to support the creation of Pakistan. Looking at this in this way, one can safely conclude that the effort of the Muslim intellectuals to enable separatism was a

failure. Majority of Indian Muslims did not support separatism, and majority of Indian Muslims did not go to Pakistan which was created and projected as the 'promised land'. On the contrary, majority of Indian Muslims became embarrassed, and ashamed in the way their religion was used as an instrument to serve some other end. And this embarrassment had become a continuous process. To find some solace to this shame and embarrassment, there had been attempt from some scholars to establish that not all Muslim intellectuals who stood by the Pakistan idea were really separatists, they actually fell for the flow. In case of Jinnah too, this had been the attempt from many Indians, both Hindus and Muslims to say that Jinnah was against the division of India and the creation of Pakistan, which is a historically true matter of fact.

But then, Jinnah's difference with dividing India in religious terms is markedly different from the Khalsa's difference from dividing India. Wahe Guru da Khalsa, Wahe Guru di Fateh; the Khalsa stood for united India simply through throwing away their very lives for the cause with a conviction, a conviction which is their very existence itself. The Khalsa and the Sikhs came into existence for Indian nation, its unity and integrity itself. To say that India must not be divided and must remain united with a conviction that of a Sikh is totally different from the position that of Jinnah. It is this difference that I wish to explore. Certainly, Jinnah was against partition not because he had some special love for the Hindus, or some special affection to the integrity and unity of India. The oneness of India as expressed through the Vedic literature is definitely alien to both Jinnah and Nehru, but Nehru made some struggles to appreciate it in his later days, especially when he became the Prime Minister and an undisputed leader through the 'grace' of Gandhi, who was the only person to have supported his becoming the Prime Minister, as against the candidature of Sardar Vallabhai Patel. Then, why Jinnah was against dividing India in religious lines?

To my mind, there could possibly be two reasons. One, a positive one, and the other, a negative one. Apart from these two reasons, I cannot envisage any other reason for Jinnah's such obstinacies against the Pakistan idea and partition of India into Hindu India and Muslim India. The positive aspect of the possibility of Jinnah's antagonism with Pakistan could be from his farsightedness itself. Jinnah knew the separatist Muslims and their mind set very well, and he also knew that what begins through separatism shall go on into separatism ad-infinitem. The projected Pakistan, which is nothing but a conglomeration of many separate Muslim pockets with multiple languages and attitudes can not co exist in peace for any given long period in time. There will not be any consistency with governance; there will not be political stability. They shall think that Islam could be an effectively uniting factor, but the world history is otherwise. Islam had hardly been any uniting factor among the Muslims; it had always functioned as a dividing factor only. There emerged many manners and patterns of separatism among the Muslims, who went on fighting one another for years together killing one another endlessly. Jinnah also knew that once religion becomes the criterion for division, then naturally religious authorities shall emerge as a power group and subsequently they will assume control over the society through religious laws and religious authorities in person. The society will have to spent much time and energy in these direction, they shall not have sufficient space to any development and Islam shall take them back in time, to the olden days of barbaric existence.

The history of Muslims in the world was in front of him. Under no exclusive Muslim rule, the people had flourished, there were hunger, poverty exploitation and lack of education. The most liberated and educated Muslims of those days were the Indian Muslims, and there flourished the Urdu language and literature, and many intellectuals came into existence. The separatist Muslim intellectuals projected that these Muslims achievements are because of the long Muslim rule in India, but perhaps Jinnah knew that all such achievements are from the fact of their co-existence with the Hindus in India. Once separated from the co-existence with non-Muslims, and once there are only Muslims to live with, their progress will come to an end, and they will start finding differences with one another. These differences will initiate in fights and killing one another in all kinds of names and feelings, and there shall be nothing at all to put an end to their going back to the barbaric ways of the Arab desert ways. Thus Jinnah knew very well that a creation of Pakistan shall be the end of what ever Islam used to be in the Mughal days, all their so called glorious past shall simply cease to be. Jinnah was perhaps more afraid of the going back in time factor, Afghanistan was in front of him, and he could see as to what happened to the erstwhile glory of Afghanistan prior to Islamistan. Iran, Iraq, Egypt and Turkey, Roman Empire and the Ottoman Empire, were all examples to Jinnah.

Jinnah was a liberated man. It would have not taken much reflection for him to realise that any society controlled by a closed door religious authority who insist that 'we are perfect and correct and the right ones, all others are wrong' and 'ours is the only true god, other gods are fake' can not make any headway towards progress. Such society will either perish or go back in time. He also might have understood that Islam will take more time to evolve out from its olden ways and days like what had happened to Christianity. Islam is still younger, and will take more time to evolve out of these sufferings.

Thus, a Dar-UI-Islam shall simply be suicide to the Muslims. Pakistan is going to be some mess, and in spite of much natural resources and fertile land, the people are going to die out of poverty. With inconsistent governments, progress will be slow, development will be slow, with parallel administration run by the religious dons, administration and law and order shall also suffer. Obviously, Jinnah did not want to give into emotions, and let his Muslim brethren suffer a life of this kind after all these. He knew very well that the best thing for the Muslims is to remain in India and be a part of it, and fight to get equality with the Hindus. There must be equal opportunities and rights for the Muslims with the Hindus, and there must be equal partnership in every field including the governance. This shall be the only thing that can redeem the Muslims and as a matter of fact, it has to be the life with the non-Muslims. But, there must always be equality for the Muslims with all non-Muslims. This was Jinnah's dream, of remaining in India, and capturing maximum for the Muslims, when others march forward, they will also be naturally taken forward in the drag. And this was the best Jinnah could do for the Muslims and he knew other wise it is all going to be miserable and a mess. Hence Jinnah opposed the idea of Pakistan tooth and nail, and kept waiting for an appropriate opportunity to be with the Congress in equal terms, always protecting Muslim rights. Ultimately, perhaps, he did not want also to quit his Bombay house as well.

This is the positive way of looking at why Jinnah was against the division of India and creation of Pakistan. It was for the good of Muslims and neither for the sake of the non-Muslims nor for Indian nation. The negative aspect as to how he opposed the division comes from another speculation.

Some say that Jinnah wanted to rule India as the Prime Minister once the British leave. There is nothing strange to this, as he must have definitely felt that he is best suited for the post. This becomes particularly so when the political situation in India was suggestive of Nehru as the future Prime Minister, with the blessings of Gandhi. Jinnah was always much above Nehru, in perhaps every field, and perhaps he found no reason as to why not he the free India's PM instead of the much less Nehru? Jinnah had an added qualification as a Muslim and a well accepted Muslim leader, and it shall be sensible to envisage, that should Jinnah is proposed as the next Indian leader after the British, all separatist calls could have ended. It must have been a simple common sense speculation for Jinnah to think that at least to avoid the division of India; some one from the Congress could have sacrificed the not much accepted Nehru aspect for Jinnah. May be he was expecting such a move from the Congress till the very last minute. I am not suggesting that Jinnah could have been power hungry, but it is much possible that he could have thought in terms of it at the sight of Nehru making a head way with the help of Gandhi. If he could be the Prime Minister of India, he could have avoided division of India and have ensured equal rights to the Muslims as he wanted. It could be concluded that Jinnah opposed the creation of Pakistan because he hoped to be the first Prime Minister of India, putting things in a negative way.

In fact both positive and negative aspect are mixed up to a great extent as it shall be a normal case only. Apart from Jinnah's egoistic need to become India's political supremo, he was for the long time as well as future interests of the Muslims in either way. His requirement was to be equal with the Hindus in every aspect if not more, but the sheer number game compelled him to aspire for equality only. He wanted the Muslims to be at par with the Hindus in every respect, and share everything in equal terms. The Muslim intellectuals were trying to project Muslims as superior to non-Muslims always, through instigating pride in them in many ways. The Muslim intellectuals always projected the Muslims to be superior to non-Muslims, and tried their best to find the lion's share for them. Later, they seem to have settled down with the demand of equality, and of sharing everything equally. Jinnah wanted this in precise terms, officially, and for ever, until perhaps Muslims out run the Hindus in number when they could go for the lion's share in a larger Dar-ul-Islam.

One thing is strange indeed. I never came across any thought from either the Congress or from the League of Making Jinnah the Prime Minister instead of Nehru as a solution to the division of India. There were no such suggestions from either side, or from any one for that matter. It is not very easy to know why no one thought in such lines, amidst such long planning and proposals. And Jinnah did not have secret henchman who could have spelt out his thoughts in disguise, as commonly done in politics. Indeed, none of these lots were 'matured' politicians, they were mere 'ab-initios' only in any case. But then, later in independent India, I came across many people especially the youngsters (of all times) suggesting that a division of India could have been avoided if Nehru had stepped down for Jinnah, and it seems all of them knew very well that a sick Jinnah is not going to last long, and so such a stepping down could have just been for some short time even. Gandhi could have not favoured this, given his track in any case; he was all for Nehru, and only because of him Nehru finally got into the job as well.

The same phenomenon, the division of India, had been seen in entirely different perspectives by Indians and Pakistanis. Their differences in interpretation are poles apart indeed. Strangely, (or it

must be just a matter of fact only, on scrupulous analysis) there are only two Indians who openly addressed the problem of Pakistan, and these two are Dr. Rajendraprasad who became the first President of India and Dr. BR Ambedkar, an important personality behind making the Constitution of India. Jinnah had made some comprehensive proposals on partition which included the concept of exchange of Hindu and Muslim population and how the minority ought to be treated in both countries. The Muslim leaders wanted India to ill treat the Muslims who remained in India, for more than one reason. If the Muslims who stayed back in India instead of migrating to the 'promised land' of Pakistan are not ill treated or badly treated by the Hindus, then all the theories propagated and projected by the Muslim intellectuals for a hundred years shall at once be proved wrong. Then they will loose credentials for being 'protectors' of Muslims from Hindu wolfs. Another thing is that, Pakistan always wanted some reasons to ill treat their minority, which they were bound to do in any way, and they wished to project this as simple retaliation. Since this had not happened in history, the diplomacy of Pakistan had to resort to speaking lies, which every one understands alright, but no one acknowledges! A befitting reply to this Muslim leader's proposal was immediately given by the future President of India in January 1946 itself through his book, "India Divided" this book indeed was a comprehensive guide line to Indian politicians who were on their 'Pathway to Pakistan'. Pakistan wanted India to treat the Muslims who remained in India as foreigners or aliens, in the old traditions of the Caliph who treated surviving minorities as 'dhimmies' or 'zimmi's', from whom 'jizyah' would be collected as special tax. Indeed this precisely is what Aurangzeb did to the non-Muslims after succeeding Shahjahan by imprisoning the father and killing other brothers for throne. In 1940, almost immediately after the Pakistan declaration, Dr. Ambedkar had written the first book, "Thoughts on Pakistan".

It had been mentioned earlier that the Congress had ever adopted a policy of 'appeasing' the Muslims through out. This must have been because of the sizable Muslim membership with them, in spite of the Muslim intellectuals' hate Hindu propaganda. Again, after independence of India, the Congress who remained in power for a long time, continued this appeasement towards the Muslims, which still continues to the discomfort of many. Indeed this 'making Muslims comfortable' always had a political side to it, as it was the earnest and sincere aspiration of Pakistan that Muslims in India must be ill treated by Hindus in India. Wht is more, Indian historians also followed this tenet, they touched nothing that shall make the Muslims unhappy; they left it all out simply. As a result, much of the real phenomena with the making of Pakistan are hardly discussed in India, and this is one of the reasons for me to depend exclusively on Pakistani sources in making this book. Such data are simply not available beyond a point in India, and hardly any one shall touch these things. The right wing historians avoided it rightly to make the Muslims happy, and the communist historians lauded India's division, given their epistemology of difference and theories of contradiction and conflict apart from what they think as an 'international'.

However, a division of India was unavoidable in unconditional terms. The situation had so become that it had become impossible for the separatist Muslims to live with the Hindus any longer. They were suffering from the hatred they themselves had created, and they could no longer go on with the mainstream in India. No matter what ever solution one might fancy, the division of India could have simply been not avoided at all, on any count. There is no point in blaming the British for division of India and there is also no point in blaming the Gandhi Nehru nexus or the Rahmat Ali

factor. The situation was so created and seasoned through a hundred years of 'operation' from the Muslim intellectuals, and many historical anecdotes. The very beginning to this is perhaps from the phenomenon of finding the language of Persian as the Muslim classical language to make it an alternative to the Hindu classical language of Sanskrit. It is difficult to trace how it all began, but one can only speculate through historical situations. May be it is so that the Muslims who settled in India as rulers found that they also need a language like the one that the Hindus are always proud of, and went for the Iranian language. This has the typical stage settings of the Muslim mind in India that always wanted to stand at least shoulder to shoulder with the Hindus. One may say that through out the Muslim rule in India, it had always been their problem and ambition to become equal with the Hindus, and a complex of some kind, therein. This typical mental stage setting is seen through out; not only through the history of Muslim rule in India, but also in the short history of the separated Pakistan, of trying to repeat and copy all that India does.

Let me venture into a small list of some such things. To begin with, the Muslims brought the Iranian language of Persian to stand against the Hindu language of Sanskrit. Then the Muslims used the Persian script to write the same spoken language of Hindi, as against the Devanagari script, and called the same language by another name, 'Urdu'. Since they wanted Urdu to be distinct from Hindi, which is an impossibility, they started using Persian words into it instead of Sanskrit words. They said India is a Hindu nation, and Muslims are another nation. They wanted to project that the Muslim culture has nothing to do with Indian culture, and they are a separate culture, a culture originating from the religion of Islam. Wanting to say that the Hindus are smaller, the Muslim intellectuals always said that they are 'universal' and Hindus are confined just to India only. Against the Indian National Congress Party, the Muslims found All India Muslim League, and said that Congress is working towards Hindu nationalism, and that the Indian nationalism is just a myth. When Pakistan became a reality, they found a Mahatma Gandhi in Iqbal, they found a Nehru in Jinnah, and a Tagore again in Iqbal and so on and so forth. In games, they were desperate to defeat India in the two events where both are good, hockey and cricket. In one word, today, what ever India does, Pakistan shall simply repeat it, and believe that they are at least at par with India, if not more.

The idea of differences, dislike, mistrust and hatred had got pumped into the minds of many Muslims by the Muslim intellectuals to an extent which had become beyond redemption, and a division of India had become just impossible to avoid. No one and nothing could have avoided it, or stopped it. If such a division was some how stopped or avoided through some mysterious miracle, then the two communities would have gone into such infightings and violence which could definitely have ruined the entire nation and made common people's lives simply miserable. Theoretically at least one could say that all those Muslims who really wanted to stay away from the Hindus had gone to Pakistan, and the left over Muslims are only the Indian Muslims. The situation was such; division was a must, for the good of both Hindus and the Muslims. The hundred years of hate Hindu campaign had rendered no option for all, except the painful partition which actually helped none except some political leadership.

Reference

1. 'Some Recent Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah' ed by Jamiluddin Ahmad, Lahore, 1952 ed, Vol I, p. 43.
2. sic
3. MA Hussain, 'Quaid's Three visits to Cambridge (1931 – 32)' TPT, 25th December, 1958.
4. Sir Wazir Hasan, *Presidential address, All India Muslim League*, Bombay, 12th April, 1936, IAR 1936, Vol. I, pp. 293 – 299.
5. TSI, 27th of September, 1937
6. IAR, 1937, Vol II pp. 402 – 409.
7. TSI Editorial, 1st October, 1937.
8. TSI, Editorial, 4th October, 1937.
9. Complete details of this incident are recorded by Sir Francis Low, 'Memories of the Quid-Eh-Azam', 'The Pakistan Society bulletin', No. 17, Autumn, 1962, pp. 17 – 18.
10. *Daily Gazette*, 19th October, 1938.
11. TSI, 15th October, 1938
12. IAR, 1938, Vol II, p.354.
13. TSI, 10th October, 1938
14. sic.
15. sic.
16. TSI, 10th and 12th October, 1938
17. back
18. CMG, 12th October, 1938.
19. Jamiluddin Ahmad, op. cit. 'The Indian Empire review'.
20. TSI Editorial, 12th October, 1938 and TMM Editorial, 13th October 1938.
21. *Inquilab*, 1st February, 1939.
22. Liaquat Ali Khan, *Presidential address*, Meerut Division Muslim League Conference, Meerut, 25th March 1939, TTI, 27th March, 1939.
23. Abdullah Haroon, *speech at the meeting of the Muslim League at Hyderabad Sindh*, 1st May, 1939, TSI, 4th May, 1939.
24. *presidential address by Raja of Pirpur*, Allahabad district Muslim League Conference, May 1939, TSI, 9th May, 1939.
25. TSI, 11th May, 1939
26. *The Deccan Times*, 11th June, 1939
27. CMG, 1st August, 1939
28. IH Qureshi, 'Sources of Indian Tradition' (Ed), W Theodore de Barry, New York, 1964 rep, Vol II, p. 282.
29. *Jinnah's speeches and writings*, Vol. I, p. 97.
30. Official record of the Viceroy – Jinnah meeting, quoted by RJ Moore, 'British Policy and Indian Problem, 1936 – 40', A paper read at partition of India, 1947, Study Conference held at the School of Oriental and African Studies, university of London, July, 1967.
31. 'all Linlithgow Collection' Eur. Mss File 125, India Office Library and Records, London.
32. *Speech at the AIML Council, Delhi, 25th February, 1940*, Jinnah's speeches and writings, Vol. I, p.152.
33. MA Jinnah, 'Two Nations in India', Time and Tide, 9th March 1940. Presumably, the article must have been written in the middle of February, when he was facing the pressure for Pakistan from all around him even within the Muslim League.
34. *Jinnah's speeches and writings*, Vol. I. pp. 154 – 55
35. VP Menon, 'The Transfer of Power in India', Calcutta, 1957. pp. 81 – 83.

36. See for example Altaf Husain's anonymous regular column in 'The Statesman' of Calcutta, during these period, Shahed, '*Dar-ul-Islam*' The Statesman, 21st February and 8th march. Abdullah Haroon, '*Muslim League and Indian Muslims*', CMG, 1st February, Muhammad Azam, '*A Constituent Assembly*', CMG, 8th March and so on.
37. Pakistan History Board, '*A short History of Hind Pakistan*', Karachi, 1955, rep 1960, and 1963, p. 435.
38. IAR, 1939, Vol. I. p. 366
39. IAR, 1939, Vol. I. p. 374
40. TSI, the 3rd of February, 1940.
41. sic.
42. Khaliquzzaman, *op.cit.*, pp. 233 – 234.
43. *The Times*, 19th February, 1940
44. '*Resolutions of the All India Muslim League from December 1938 to March 1940*', Delhi, n.d, Resolution No 1, pp. 47 – 48.
45. '*Jinnah's Speeches and Writings*' Vol. I. p. 188, p. 206, p. 264, p.267, pp. 273 – 277, p. 280, pp. 419 – 420, p. 464, p. 576.
46. *Jinnah's Speeches and Writings*, Vol. I. p. 448.
47. Vol. II. P. 236.
48. MAH Ispahani, '*Quaid –Eh-Azam Jinnah as I Knew Him*', Karachi, 2nd Edition, 1967, pp144 – 145.

Towards a Conclusion

On the face of it, one may say that, Terrorism had come to stay for long with the world society. Perhaps the situations shall be more aggressive for the time to come in future, and we ought to be rather prepared for many unknown and unpredictable situations. The world has to deal with terrorism, and as a prerequisite to it, a hermeneutics of terrorism becomes essential. A totalistic understanding of the phenomenon of terrorism is the only method towards any preparation of dealing with it, and further, making efforts to end or curtail this malady. As a result, a hermeneutics of terrorism becomes the first step.

Towards a hermeneutics of terrorism

Any effort towards a hermeneutics of terrorism ought to start with the mind concerned, and other analysis such as social, political, religious and the like can come only later. On a final analysis, it simply is a state of mind. If one asks Sigmund Freud about this, he has his explanations through his psycho analysis theory, the notions of wishes, wish fulfillments, repressed complexes, the wish fulfillment technique of the mind, Libido and so on. It is very possible to get much insights from a Freudian kind of understanding, but it may not be very sufficient. Given the concept of alienation from Karl Marx, one could argue that the terrorist minds often suffer from estrangement and alienation, but this could at once get stultified when it is asked as to the source of such alienation. Here, there may be a process of alienation or estrangement, but it all originates from the self itself, or from many similar selves which are some sort of conglomeration that might tent to operate as a single self. This has its deep rooted and definite reasons: and here, we just get back to square one.

With Freud, the whole thing shall depend on wishes from human minds. Some wishes that do not simply get fulfilled, with the strong possibility of them never getting fulfilled. What may be those un fulfilled wishes leading some minds to terrorism? Naturally, they ought to be wishes for some definite social order, or more than that, political order. Once such aspired and envisaged order becomes an impossibility, the mind may go into action; of striving to achieve it. At this point, it becomes imperative to make a distinction between positive aspiration which shall be accounted as constructive, and negative aspiration, which shall be accounted as destructive. From the positive aspiration, there arises a whole series of social activism, from running homes for mentally retarded children to homes for old age, and even the Red Cross itself. We do see many such volunteer missions around us. Here, the leading principle remains love towards mankind.

On the other hand, it is the negative aspirations which becomes destructive, with the leading principle of dislike and hate at times arising from frustrations rather than repressed complexes. Let me make a hypothetical case as example here from the Hindu Dharma. Should a Hindu mind thinks in terms of reinventing the erstwhile Vedic glory in contemporary times, this aspiration can take two different courses in the light of what is mentioned above. One, shall be that of an evolutionary, positive and constructive path, as shown by many people. The instance of Maharishi Dayanand Saraswati is one. Here, reinvention of Vedic glory is not a going back in time, and on the contrary, it shall be one that of re-inventing the Vedic glory in given space and time with

permissible alterations to suit the need from time to time and as an on going p[rocess]. Many people, including the Gandhi had been at this. And suppose that one get negative who would want to re-establish the Vedic glory et-verbatim, that will be a revolutionary approach; it shall be guided by dislike and hatred to all others who do not subscribe to his view and this indeed shall be eventually getting into violence. This at once becomes terrorism in any normal society.

Now, leaving both Freud and Marx, we can look at this through a different perspective as well. Actually, this is the perspective of Religion. Students of religion like Rudolf Otto, Kitagawa, Raymond Panikkar and many such people tried to make a hermeneutics of religion. When it comes to CR Agera, he suggests that Religion is the fundamental intentionality of human consciousness towards the sacred. This speaks of a transcendental longing, a transcendental longing of the conscious human mind towards the beyond: carrying ultimate questions and fundamental problems. The transcendental level remains necessarily unknown and unknowable given cognitivity and sensory experiential understanding. The suggestion made by Buddha is significant here. Buddha would say this about the questions of God. The God, if any, shall be infinite by definition and the human mind finite. Hence, how can anyone even think in terms of 'knowing' the infinite with and through what is finite? Here a contradiction at once becomes apparent. What results from this is the utter helplessness of man's mind in his inability to know the transcendental; unless and otherwise some different methods are instantly put into practice, as claimed to be done by the Indian philosophers and sages.

Again, akin to this transcendental longing of the human consciousness, man also can experience another longing of making the world a better place. Here also, there shall be positive, constructive and evolutionary longing to act in terms of bettering the world that does culminate in many social reforms and such movements. The negative longing which is revolutionary and destructive can eventually lead to hatred, mistrust and eventually to terrorism. Something had to be done instantly to make the world the way the mind thinks; and the mind here has no patience; it refuses to wait; and resorts to something drastic in the revolutionary pattern. And when nothing favorably happens in the long run, the mind becomes frustrated, and then plans in terms of planting bombs anywhere to get the frustrations released; the mind here secretly enjoys the stoic syndrome of martyrdom. Strangely, the mind erects all kinds of justifications and reasons to this, starting from tradition to religion. What is important here is, there are no windows with such minds so that there is no possibility for any different thoughts to get in: hence it makes the situation also an impossible one.

Thus terrorism is a mindset; arising from a permanent disposition of mind, which is fundamentally negative. This also may be compared to the criminal attitude of criminal minds, which may be attempted to be explained in all kinds of ways, but they all tend to be explaining away things. There may be some possibility of dealing with such mind sets right from deep within the mind itself; but it is for the science of mind to work towards it. However, the availability of co-operative terrorist minds for such 'operation' goes without mentioning: it is also the case that to what extent this can become a possibility in reality.

Though there can be terrorisms of all manner and forms, the thing in discussion here is Jihadi terrorism only. This is from a simple reason, as Jihadi terrorism is the most experienced one today. Some terrorisms like Jihadi terrorism has yet another property apart from the typical mind set for terrorism, and that is the feeling of one being separate from the other. It is this feeling that eventually culminates into separatism and the notion of separatism shall find expressions in manifold manner. Precisely, it is for the same reason that in the previous pages we see a lot of arguments towards separatism, and a lot of people working towards such ideas as well as ideals. I made enough and more expositions of the ideas of separatism from intellectuals for a period that is not less than that of one hundred years in India. They are illustrations from history: evidences from history towards separatism which used to be looked at as a simple phenomenon by the then minds, but actually that is what had given rise to contemporary Jihadi terrorism which many are now trying to understand and curtail. It is this point alone that this book is trying to caricature and explain with the hope that a fundamental and deep structural understanding becomes possible so that we may remain better equipped to deal with Jihadi terrorism.

Jihadi terrorism is formatted through the religious frame work of Islam with Queranic quotations wrongly interpreted to meet the requirement of a wrong mind. As a matter of fact, all other parts of Queran which opposes either violence or attack on the others get conveniently sidelined. It is normal with monarchs to use religion to their political ends, and in the history of Islam, in most cases, Islam had been with monarchies, Sultanates, and even with despots. In 'Prince and other writings', Machiavelli amply demonstrates the need for justification of monarchy on the part of the monarch: that is, from time immemorial authorities had always resorted to some sort of divine or the other justification for their being in the authority as well as continuation. The instance of the Pharaohs itself is a classic case when they called themselves some sort of gods. Since it is the case that Islam mostly had been with monarchy of this or that type, the monarchs found it very convenient and easy to make Islam an instrument to their authority. The situation was much helped with the general illiteracy among the Muslims, and the authority remained vigilant not to allow stipulated ideas into their society. A simple glancing around our present world alone shall be sufficient proof to this, just see the world around to witness as to how authorities all over had desperately tried to use Islam to their ends, which, indeed had been their very existence as monarchs.

And no wonder why there had been so much opposition against the very ideas of democracy. To the common Muslims, Islam had been presented through the nexus of monarchs and mullas, and what they get as religion might have been largely different from the holy text. Similar things also happened with the Bible, as there used to be Papacy at one time. Common Christians had no serious access to the holy text, and they were to swallow interpretations given from above, with all kinds of nefarious and vested interests. Christianity did not have to wait very long for a Martin Luther to materialise in the form of the Dominican Monk: and this process went on to refine the Catholic Church as well; they were very dynamic and agile to make corrections so quickly and change themselves. Let us say, the Catholic Church had moved with the time and space, in spite of some initial lag and lethargy. Such things had not happened with Islam and perhaps it may take some more time.

Once upon a time, particularly with the upcoming of a new religion, there used to be much vigor and thrill in making it known to all others, and converting all others to the new faith. This process had hardly been intellectual, it used to be both physical and political. This had happened to Christianity, Islam and though on a lower level, even to Buddhism. I am referring to Emperor Asoka and his new found faith in Buddhism, as many people followed him to Buddhism when he adopted the religion. Much later, Buddhism was also politically used by the low castes in India when Dr. BR Ambedkar made many low caste Hindus Buddhists in the belief that it would end caste stigma. The same thing was about to take place in the southern point in India, Kerala, where people of the Ezhava caste were being given directions to convert into Buddhism to escape caste stigma. Then the poet Kumaran Asan vehemently opposed the move tooth and nail through profuse arguments to demonstrate the folly in such notions. His entire speech is available in print form, and it is very interesting to go through that. The ezhavas also had a spiritual leader, a sage, who was a Vedantin, and he also stopped the attempt of conversion into Buddhism. In all these cases, religion was politically and socially being used, whether or not for good, bad.

The first Arab invader of Sindh, Muhammad Bin Quasim thought it convenient to convert the people of the invaded land into Islam, to make his authority strong. Indeed this making people convert into the invaders religion used to be very effective, and most of the invaders continued in that line. The English also were never behind this during their colonial rule in India, albeit there already were Christians in India at the time of their colonisation. There were many innocent missionaries who were convinced that through Christianity they are giving civilisation to the dark people, but there were also some others, who knew very well what they were doing. What we have here is as simple phenomenon which is also universal, religion had been used by almost every one for both political, social and cultural domination. However, why religion appeared to Marx as opium is still another reason.

In a homogeneous Islamic society, an idea of I am separate from the other - until there are different sects of Islam – shall be trivial. Such ideas can have significance only where people of other faith exist. The ideas of I am separate from others can again be politically motivated, or motivated for other ends that has its origin in either social and political domination or both. India in this context had been the most fertile land, where the Muslim intellectuals had been the least religiously dominated either by the religious authorities or by the political authorities. And still, the ideas of separatism had been the strongest in India albeit these two factors were significantly absent. On the face of it this appears to be a paradox at once. There was no patriarch to separatism in India, and yet, there existed such strong separatism that had divided the nation. Some people would accuse the British for this, saying that it is all their creation, and this is obviously wrong. Truly enough, the British 'used' the Hindu Muslim difference heartily to 'divide and rule', but they are not the creators of separatism. They had impressed upon it and augmented it whenever they felt it as necessary, and they had no more role in it. Hence any role from any external agent to separatism among the minds of Indian Muslims is simply ruled out.

We saw that in their efforts to juxtapose Sanskrit language, Muslim intellectuals in India had taken Persian as a substitute. This had opened the doors to much Islamic literature to them apart from others. It is here that we find intellectuals replacing monarchs and mullas in modern times. On a closer analysis one can see that the ultimate interests of the intellectuals is not much different from

those of the monarch mulla nexus, as we also see the intellectuals aspiring for recognition, name and fame as well as some form of authority, political or other. We know that power seekers have changed their gamut in modern times, and subjugation as well as domination also had changed gamut. The case of Jamaluddin Afghani is perhaps the last of a monarchical aspirant: and now it all changes paradigms of power and authority along with changing times. The role played by the Muslim intellectuals in India between 1857 and 1947 amply demonstrate this. Previously we could believe that education can change things with terrorists, but now we know that education corrupts terrorists into serious terrorism. The first glimpses of this phenomenon is witnessed through the Muslim intellectuals and their separatist writings, speeches as well as actions in India.

The basic hegemony put into the minds of common Muslims is that they are different from non-Muslims. There can be all sorts of convincing arguments to this, convincing them using all kinds of tools and instruments available to the intellectuals. Then a greatness of Muslims are planted against the 'being silly' of the others. Indeed, Hegemony, or Ideology ought to be the case here. Ideology is a theory, first used by Destut De Tracy, that had developed through Francis Bacon, Machiavelli and many others, and matured mostly in Marx and Lenin to mean a system of thoughts designed to keep people under spurious ideas, thoughts to justify social domination and to project that everything is fine and correct, intellectually legitimising it. Keeping the people ignorant of reality and dominating them to serve some other ends is the process here. Subsequently we also find Antonio Gramsci using the concept of Hegemony to mean precisely the same thing, and the structuralist Althusser going to the extent of 'Ideological State Apparatus'.

Apart from common experiences of Ideology and Hegemony, the religious Ideology of the Jihadi terrorist becomes manifold and intense. In general Ideology, it is more intellectual than emotional, the intellectual deception is not that intimate through emotions and sentiments of common human existence. In case of the Ideology of Jihadi terrorism, it is intellectual plus intimately emotional with common human existence and it becomes normal for Jihadis to go for self-annihilation in the name of religion. The religious authority, not necessarily a Maulavi but any one who can quote the religious text for justification of what he says can easily put spurious hopes and fear in the minds of common believers of punishments and rewards from heaven above and make common people instruments. This instrumentality is blind and irrational, but to an insider, it is just normal way of existing in the path of righteousness. This becomes the serious problem in dealing with terrorism as well as terrorists.

They are so convinced that what they do is just the right thing, they are right, and only the right ones. Their faith system as they see is the only right thing: here it is extremely important to notice that 'faith system as they see'. The same faith system as someone else might see is not at all right or good to them, and they become hostile to people of the same faith system with even slight different perspective and they would go planting bombs in such peoples domiciles. Ironically, the more one is educated, the more narrow he becomes here, and the more one gets convinced in his being separate and superior from the other, and the more one start hating the others. Then there is this formidable promises of rewards and punishments from heaven above, and whatever they do or undo, they keep taking the name of the almighty. Everyone does everything in the name of the almighty. Others have just one option of remaining simply confused in their respective civilisations.

Here, Jihadi terrorism becomes a mixture of faith as in a given perspective, beliefs in punishments and rewards from heaven above, hope of a promised life after death in a luxurious heaven, and the conviction that they are so totally right and all others are so totally wrong and the execution of terrorist programmes become simply a holy duty assigned from heaven above through an eligible leader. Any possibility of entering into the minds of any terrorist is thus ruled out, as the other by definition is an enemy who is out there to destroy his faith system and religion. Freud becomes very instructive here.

Perhaps the intensity of separatism is directly proportional to the intensity of hatred to others who are different. Hatred becomes so intense and the terrorist is fully convinced that the available option is simply to kill all others who are different from his own imaginary faith system which he had created of his own through instructions and interpretations of similar people. He doesn't think that he is killing innocent people, for him all others, innocent, black, white as well as people of the same faith system are just one and the same. In most of the cases, each terrorist shall have a different type of conviction, but they do not get much opportunity to realise this; such realisations can come only through long time testing. For the present, they stand together and go about destroying irrespective what where and when.

Dealing with terrorism

Now to the prize question: how to deal with the phenomenon of terrorism, so that one can think in terms of dealing with terrorists? Some attempt to 'educating' them is already demonstrated to be futile. It is also discussed that no amount of reasoning or arguments can ever make them realise that they are doing something wrong. Correcting them through any means is an impossibility; particularly so, when one is educated. This had been well demonstrated through the separatist Muslim intellectuals' writings of India for a hundred years of time which had been crucial as well as volatile. The only possibility that can be envisaged is an attempt to address the mental attitude, which at once shall turn to be self-stultifying. The Upanishads speak of "*Stāyī Bhāva*", something like a permanent disposition of mind. Upanishads speak of the mind, as being permanently and fundamentally disposed of towards a particular attitude, that can not be basically altered or changed. They would explain the phenomenon transcendently but that would be far flung from having any empirical use instantly.

When one is so disposed to be so, which may be the structure itself, there is nothing much to be done at once. Some programme could be thought of on some long terms basis, which may have to be adopted after all, but that, definitely is not of any immediate use, and the phenomenon in question here calls for immediate remedy. What to do? We are really back to square one. And yet, some thoughts to remedy this malady also can not be spared.

It is essential that the phenomenon of Jihadi terrorism must be treated politically. This means, that the world nations will have to address this diplomatically and also internationally. One important difficulty in dealing with terrorists is that they all are citizens of this or that nations, and they also do carry the privileges of citizens. Nations all over the world ought to come together and de-citizenise terrorists, so that they shall not have any privileges as well as protection of any nation. This shall

make it illegal for them to hold any passport or stay in any nation. Terrorists identified and proved to be so ought to put in a separate place, some sort of camps with consensus from the world nations. In those camps it must be possible to try and repair their mental attitudes, and arguably, erroneous convictions fundamentally through discussions with them. Terrorists will be vocal, arrogant and outspoken about their goals and missions, and it is these convictions what we ought to bring before common sense and reason to put an end to such attitudes and convictions. Here we shall need Philosophers, Theologians, Politicians and even Psychologists, but certainly not physical coercion.

And what is a prerequisite to all these shall be framing of some new laws by the international community exclusively to deal with terrorism. Once someone is proven to be a terrorist, he at once becomes de-citizenised and subject to the special laws for the terrorists. All rights to him gets automatically removed, and he or she goes to the stipulated camps.

Should any society is found supporting or abetting terrorism, such societies, nations etc. should be boycotted by everyone. Once isolation is a guarantee, no nation is going to support or abet terrorism, and no one is going to run camps for the terrorists, and provide financial support to them. At present, some nations use terrorism and terrorist training camps to get some support for them, to maintain authority and rule by no matter who is in the rule. The rulers who are not stable and steady go for short cuts to remain in power, and where it is possible, they look for all sort of help from all sort of places, including the terrorists and such out fits. Here we can see many playing double standard: on the one hand they plead innocence and on the other hand they abet terrorism, and what is interesting is, everyone knows everything, and even they themselves know that everyone knows everything, and yet, they go on refusing everything in public. Who are the deceivers and who are the deceived here?

By and large, religion had only been a disguise to political power and other ends. Religion is the not the cause of Jihadi terrorism, the real cause is power and politics. Religion is actually been used by the power people to make terrorists do things, to become something, within nations, as well as internationally. Religion is only on the face of it, at the surface level, but the deep cause is always different from religion and has nothing to do with religion. at this point, one can say that religion is just abused by people of the interest group.

We do have examples of despots and monarchs making religion their instrument to make hegemonies, and we also see the antithesis of this phenomenon again using the same religion to create another anti-hegemony to over throw such monarchs and despots. Some other situations present us the role of religious hegemony as a means in capturing power, and at the same time in some other situations, it functions the other way. In Libiya, we saw the despot pleading in the name of religion, and we also saw the rebels doing the same thing as well. Certainly, they were both speaking of the same religion. Again, during the Iran Iraq war, we saw both countries making pleas and taking oaths in the name religion, and again, they both were doing so with the same religion with some sectarian differences.

Hence, while reflecting on Jihadi terrorism, if we are going to focus on the religion of Islam as the base structure and root cause, I should caution that we are focusing our thoughts in the wrong direction. It is not the religion of Islam, it is how the religion of Islam is represented by the so called

authorities and autochthones to common people. In the novel, *Brothers Karamazov*, Dostoyevsky speaks about this phenomenon at length. People in general simply want to be told, and they do not want to think for themselves. Dostoyevsky has a valid point here. They are told, they get carried off, and they are so easily led to wherever wanted. In reality, religion as such has just nothing to do here. And this can happen to any religion in the world, not only to Islam. Islam is more vulnerable for many reasons, but other religions are not invincible.

During my narration of the activities of Muslim intellectuals of India for nearly a hundred years this aspect of religion had been made explicit sufficiently. For a hundred years the separatist intellectuals had been trying hard to bring it to the minds of Indian Muslims that Muslims are a separate nation and they cannot live with people of other religions. And in spite of all these, when Pakistan was formed, more Muslims opted to stay back in India than the total population of Pakistan. This is another proof to the fact that not all people can be carried away through religious hegemony which is artificial creation aimed at intellectual deception of the common people. My narration through the previous eight chapters demonstrates how and to what extent separatism and hatred had been so desperately pumped into the minds of common people, Hindus and Muslims alike.

This is 'Ideology'. Ideology had been a theory with political thinking, which could be traced back to Sir Francis Bacon and Machiavelli. Essentially, Ideology is intellectual deception aimed at common people to keep them under domination through systems of spurious thoughts and similar theories. The domination normally is social domination for the purpose of political domination from the rulers. Bacon speaks of four types of such 'ideals' through which social and political domination is done. They are, Idols of the Tribe, Idols of the Cave, Idols of the Market place and Idols of the Theatre. Here, Cave, Tribe, Market place and Theatre are perhaps self-explanatory and I do not intend to go into the details. To Bacon's eyes, these four aspects are what essentially controls and regulates human thoughts. Machiavelli makes an interesting observation while speaking about the Princes, implying despots and monarchs. In the book *The Prince* and other writings, he says that the Prince shall simply be a deceiver. A prince need not have any qualities etc. which he is expected to be possessing, it is simply sufficient if he makes people believe that he has all such qualities. Further, Machiavelli says that when someone is a prince, he knows how best to deceive common people into believing that he has all the glorious qualities richly albeit he has nothing of them.

Later, through political philosophies, we come across the further development of the theory of Ideology through both space and time. Karl Marx had written a book itself on 'The German Ideology'. The Communists who took to following Marx in various pattern also became interested in the theory of Ideology and they also developed it. The empiricistic obsessions of the Marxists lead them to making all kinds of theories and formulations, mostly elusively technical, technical of the Communist kind, often missing the spirits and points as to what objectives they had been setting out to. Neo-Marxists furthered the theory of Ideology, Antonio Gramsci made it a theory of Hegemony and Louis Althusser went into making his theory of Ideological State Apparatus and numbering such ISAs. Lenin tried to give a positive twist to the concept of Ideology by making 'revolutionary Ideology' a progressive and positive phenomena and is a welcome thought.

In all, whatever or however may be the hermeneutics with the concept of Ideology, it is essentially a synthetic creation with the purposive and nefarious intention of intellectual deception for some kind of domination of common people. The domination may be of maintaining a given system of rule or even of mobilising common people into some desired end. The second Aryan invasion theory propagated through Max Muller by B McCauley to prolong the British Colonial domination over India is a classical instance of Ideology, though the theory resulted in Germany's victory in the Franco Prussian war and actually bounced back on the British.

Jihadi terrorism is actually an Ideology created by some section of people for their immediate and instant gains. This is also a political phenomenon, some one wishes to continue maintaining their domination and someone else wishes to become dominant. In either case, Jihadi terrorism becomes a most easy and instant tool to reach some set goals. The complexity becomes further intricate with the specificities of each separate phenomenon of Jihadi terrorism. Commonly it appears as Jihadi terrorism as such, but then they all are so distinct and specific from one another. So many things are so different with each of them, but they all get expressed in the form of Jihadi terrorism. This, out rightly means that there are so many different negativisms operating through many frustrations, mostly political as it was already mentioned, and they find expressions through Jihadi terrorism simply because they all happened to have Muslim connections. The interest groups here effectively connect everything to Islam, and make it manifest as Jihadi terrorism. Of course, there are many complexities and intricacies within each of them so specific and particular, but the interest group or persons make it manifest through Jihadi terrorism as it is most effective. Many things like the religious fervor of common believers, lack of consciousness, distrust and dislike to others who do not belong to the same sect, and spurious attitude of I am the best hegemony, they all go into the making of it.

What really makes this easily possible is the misplaced belief that Islam all over is the same. The identity of a society here is mutilated through a paradigm shift from culture to religion. As a matter of common sense and fact religion and culture are inter connected indeed; but there is no necessary connection between religion and culture. Culture essentially belongs to the civilisation of a given society, it is refined human behavior, and evolves out of growth and development of each society. At the same time, it is also very interesting to note that there is hardly any society that developed a strong civilisation without having relations with other civilisations existing both near and far. Hence, when we speak of civilisation and culture, it may not be very correct to attribute exclusive rights to one particular society alone, there must have been many gives and takes from many other societies also in the formation of one culture, though it remains the 'property' of the given society. And this is also natural, and precisely for this aspect, they all remain dynamic and lively.

Religion functions as carrier of culture from generations to generations, and it is the most effective carrier, preserver and protector. But since there is no necessary connection between religion and culture apart from the existing society, when religion moves from one society to another society, it simply does not carry the culture along with it. What happens here is significant. When religion moves from one society to another society, it shuns the culture of the society from where it moves out, and receives and accepts the culture of the society to which it enters. Religion carries faith systems, rites, rituals, and prayer patters, but does not and can not carry culture along with it as it

moves on from place to place. It gets acultured into the new society and becomes one that of that society, simply because when people changes faiths, they cannot change their culture. Changing faith is rather simple, through some kind of an initiation ceremony, but culture is not learned in the same manner. No matter how hard one may try to 'learn' and belong to a different culture, the result shall only make him a desperate hybrid of no good.

The only exception that come to my mind is that of the Jews. Jews were forced to flee all over the world for a long period of something like two thousand years, and at every place they were persecuted. The Indians here can be both happy and proud: perhaps the only society in the entire world where the Jews were not persecuted is the Indian society. They came, stayed. Made Synagogues, worshipped and practiced their religion, and went back when Israel became a reality. Here something else was happening: Jews never converted others into Judaism, they did not make other people Jews, and people from other culture did not enter into their religious frame work. As a result, their culture remained with them where ever they went and lived no matter how long, they remained the same people all over the world, and it was rather easy for them to get together after two thousand years. They did not increase their numbers, but they remained by and large what they used to be. Judaism did not have to shun the culture of their society since no one from any other society could ever enter into their religion.

With Christianity and Islam, this is not the case. They both converted others into their religion, whenever they found opportunities. Sometimes conversions were forced, some times it was through authorities, and some other time it used to be through many forms of enticements. Here, it becomes necessary to make some comparisons between Islam and Christianity. They both have many sects within their broad frame work, and in Christianity, to the best of my knowing, all sects usually get passed as Christians without much objections or problems. On the other hand, this is not strictly so with Islam. They also have many sects within them, but all sects do not get passed as Muslims. One example that comes to my mind is that of the Ahammadiyyas, or the Kadiyani Muslims. There is a sect among the Muslims who originated from the place Kadiyan near Batala in the Guridaspur district of Indian Punjab. They are not normally accepted as Muslims by others, especially in Islamic nations like one that of Pakistan. At times, this un acceptance also can turn into hostilities and killings, though it is not that serious in India with the Ahammadiyyas largely due to Indian tolerance. Sectarianism within a sect to the point of hostility may only be in the Islamic world and nowhere else. Both Muslims and Christians have separate Churches and Mosques for different sects, but modern Christians do not disrespect the Church of another sect. whereas, one sect of Muslim is often found blasting bombs in the mosque of another sect in Pakistan.

When one takes the example of the Catholic Church, there is no doubt that they are most organised ones with a strict hierarchy. Yet, no one ever said that Catholics are a "nation" trans the boundaries of other nations. With Islam, it was very often repeated that Muslims are a nation. Christianity in India had become long become an Indian religion, and officially itself as an Indian religion. They have Russian Church, Indian Church etc., where Christianity is simply a local religion apart from faith, rituals and the like. In one word, Christianity in India had internalised Indian culture so spontaneously over a period of time, and no Christian religious authority stood against it. With Islam this did not happen. Actually, this was happening with Islam also, because the new found Muslims were after all Indians, but then the authority tried their best to keep them

estranged from the local culture, and this also did not succeed much. But the ideology was unleashed, the hegemony was floating, that Muslims are a nation no matter where. Some got influenced, and some did not.

It is this Ideology, this hegemony that originated from India that Muslims are a nation that went a long way to make some people think and feel that the Muslims are trans-culture and they all, all over the world are just one. Some people feel it good to say that Muslims are a nation, and some people feel it good to think so, and some others spread this hegemony, and many fall victim to it by becoming terrorists.

And this spurious one-ness goes a long way in getting everything into the frame of jihadi terrorism. In reality, there is no Jihad: there is only terrorism. They want to make terrorism Jihad, to win the supports of many. Ironically, the intra-sectarian differences and contradictions within different sects of Islam had never opened the eyes of many to see this Ideology or false consciousness of one-ness. When each personal whim can get passed as Jihad, the world shall indeed become a most unfriendly place to live in. When any atrocity can be camouflaged as holy war, when the faith of common innocents could be taken for a ride, it becomes a social problem for one and all. When everyone makes appeal to the almighty for whatever they do to win over the minds of common believers, the situation shall be anarchical.

To conclude, let me say that first of all, it is wrong to think that Islam is the cause of Jihadi terrorism. At the same time, it is also wrong to think and feel that all Muslims are terrorists. It is true that some people use Islamic principles interpreted to their convenience to create a feeling of 'the other' in the minds of believers, from where separatism begins, and ultimately this can also go into terrorism. But then, the mistake is essentially one that of epistemological difference. The chain can be traced as something like this. Feeling of I am the only right – the other is all different – I am separate from the other – I am different from the other and the other is all different from yet other the other – I cannot live with him – no co-existence possible.

References

1. Machiavelli, *Discourse*, Penguin – 1970.
2. Machiavelli, *The Prince*, G. Bull (tr) Penguin, 1974.
3. Francis Bacon, *The new organon and Related Writings*, O. Piest (ed) Liberal Arts NY, 1974.
4. Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, CB Macpherson (ed) Penguin 1975.
5. Hans Brath, *Truth and Ideology*, F Lilge (tr) cu Press, 1976.
6. Marx & Engels, *The Holy Family*, R Dixon & C Dutt (tr) Progress, 1975.
7. D'Holbach, *System de la nature*, George Olms Hidesbeim, 1966.
8. Marx, *Thesis on Feurbach*, 1970.
9. E Condillac, *Traite des Systems* 1947.
10. Destutt de Tracy, *Elements de Ideologie*, Levi Library, 1827.
11. *Auguste Comte*, G Lenser (ed) Harper and Row 1975.
12. Antonio Gramsci, *Prison Notes*.
13. L Althusser, *Lenin and other essays*.
14. CR Agera *Religious Critique of Culture*

Dr. TS Girishkumar

TS Girishkumar belongs to a family of freedom fighters and soldiers, with his grand father winning Tamrapatra in the very first list posthumously. Following the family tradition, he also joined the defence, Indian Air Force and served the nation with the prime of youth for 11 years. Then he joined the Womens' college Shillong, as lecturer to teach Philosophy. From there he joined the Don Bosco College Tura as Head of the department of Philosophy to establish a Philosophy department. Got married to Smitakumari, daughter of another freedom fighter and to a family of teachers. After that he joined the Mahatma Gandhi University and was the Director of the School of Social Sciences. Presently he is continueing with the Mahatma Gandhi University. TS Girishkumar has three children, first twins, *Viṣṇu Sarma* and *Vināyaka Sarma*, both Polymer Engineers, and the third, *Viśārad Sarma* is in School. TS Girishkumar is born on the 11th of May, 1956. His family lives in *Vadōdara*, Gujarat.

